JKM LIBRARY
3 9967 00333 1738

VIRGINIA LIBRARY

McCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHICAGO
826 Belden Avenue

7

OBERLIN

THURSDAY LECTURES

ADDRESSES

AND

ESSAYS.

BY
JAMES MONROE.

OBERLIN, OHIO:
EDWARD J. GOODRICH
1897.

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY.
CHICAGO

Copyright, 1897,
By Edward J. Goodrich.

Pearce, Randolph and Company,
Oberlin, Ohio.

JKM Library
1100 East 55th Street
Chicago, IL 60615

E
449
M753

PREFACE.

MANY of my pupils have asked that I would publish a small book containing such of my lectures as were connected with some of the more interesting experiences of my life. This volume is an attempt to comply, in part, with the wish so expressed. Most of these papers had their place in an institution known to all Oberlin students as the Thursday Lecture. Two are occasional addresses; and for the privilege of reprinting two others in this collection, I am indebted to the courtesy of Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Company and the Bibliotheca Sacra Company. The obligation is specially acknowledged in the proper place. The lectures are not printed in the order in which they were delivered, but in the chronological order of the events described in them. In this way they become, in a measure and indirectly, autobiographical, which my pupils have expressed a desire that they should be. Some of these lectures were delivered as long ago as the early eighties, which will explain the occasional incompleteness in the account of men and events. It has been thought best to leave the lectures substantially as they were presented at the time. This book is dedicated to my pupils as a memorial of the many pleasant hours which I have passed in their society.

JAMES MONROE.

OBERLIN, *May*, 1897.

100392

CONTENTS.

The Early Abolitionists.—I. Introductory. 1

The Early Abolitionists.—II. Personal Recollections 27

The Early Abolitionists.—III. Frederick Douglass 57

My First Legislative Experience.—I. Work in the Legislature 95

My First Legislative Experience.—II. Reception by the People 131

A Journey to Virginia in December, 1859.... 158

Special Duties of Consuls of the United States during the Civil War 185

William H. Seward and the Foreign Affairs of the United States 211

The Hayes-Tilden Electoral Commission ... 254

Leading Speakers in Congress from 1871 to 1881 306

Joseph as a Statesman 348

THE EARLY ABOLITIONISTS.

I.

INTRODUCTORY.

A THURSDAY LECTURE.

UNTIL nearly the close of the last century, and especially during what is known as the Revolutionary period, the prevailing opinion both North and South, in the colonies and States of this country, was favorable to the abolition of slavery. The testimony to this is so abundant and so familiar that it cannot be necessary to detain you by quoting any portion of it. It may be sufficient to say that the Ordinance of 1787, which made slavery forever impossible in all the territory northwest of the Ohio—which was all the territory that the United States then owned—was but the natural expression of the general feeling. Daniel Webster, in his celebrated speech of the 7th of March, 1850, says that this ordinance received the vote of every Southern member of the Confederate Congress, and that but one vote

was given against it, and that by a Northern man. So almost universal was the anti-slavery sentiment of that time.

But during the first thirty years of the present century, a complete revolution of opinion took place upon this question. Slavery, from being a subject of condemnation and legal restriction, became so intrenched in the popular sympathy that it could not be freely discussed, even in the Northern States, without some risk of personal injury. It is interesting to inquire what caused this change, which is one of the most remarkable known in history. Mr. Webster, in the speech already referred to, tells us very truly that it was caused by the sudden and enormous development of cotton production. And this expansion of cotton culture was due, although he does not mention it, to the invention of a simple and inexpensive machine by Eli Whitney, a Connecticut school teacher, then residing in Savannah.

I am largely indebted to Horace Greeley's "American Conflict" and to Henry Wilson's "Rise and Fall of the Slave Power" for my summary of historical facts contained in these opening paragraphs.

Before the invention of the cotton gin, that product was hardly worth the cost of cultiva-

tion, on account of the difficulty of separating the seed from the fiber. A negro who had cleaned a pound of cotton was regarded as having done a fair day's work. But the same negro, with the aid of the gin, when instructed in its use, could clean three hundred pounds in a day—which was accomplishing in a day what had formerly been the work of a year. Thus was brought to pass by a single mind one of the most marvelous revolutions in production and trade the world has ever seen. The production of cotton advanced from about seven or eight thousand bales in 1793, the year of the invention, worth perhaps $700,000, to one million of bales in 1830, worth $45,000,000, 5,761,000 bales in 1880, worth $242,000,000, and 7,300,000 bales in 1890, of the value of $308,400,000. Cotton culture, which had been held in light esteem, soon became immensely profitable, and the cotton gin took its place among the few great inventions that have changed the fortunes of mankind. Whitney obtained a patent for his invention, but he derived no benefit from it. His private workshop was broken into, and his machine, when nearly completed, was carried off. Machines closely resembling it soon appeared in different parts of the South. Of course he prosecuted for

infringement of his patent; but witnesses were afraid to appear, or juries failed to convict, or the law's delays wore out his strength and exhausted his slender means, and when, in 1807, he finally obtained an effective judgment for his protection in the United States Court for the District of Georgia, his patent was already in the last year of its existence. An effort for its renewal, which he subsequently made, was defeated by the votes and influence of Southern members of Congress. When the account with his invention was balanced he was not a cent the richer for it. It has been stated by Horace Greeley that he conferred upon the slave States a benefit which, at a moderate estimate, was worth a thousand millions of dollars, and they gave him nothing but persecution in return. This need not surprise us. Why should those who had a traditional and long-cultivated indifference to men's claims to the ownership of themselves and to the society of their wives and children, hesitate to withhold from a Yankee mechanic the proper reward of his labor?

Those of you who are curious in tracing remoter relations and results, will be interested to learn that after his failure in the South, Whitney returned to Connecticut, where he

acquired a fortune by the invention and manufacture of an improved fire-arm. The Whitney gun with the subsequent improvements became, as Mr. Greeley tells us, one of the most effective weapons of war known to the world. As the American rifled musket, it was widely used during the late Civil conflict, and the dead inventor, through a thousand messages of fire, uttered his protest against the old ill-usage. His first invention the slaveholders took without his consent; his second they took without their own consent.

> "Though the mills of God grind slowly,
> Yet they grind exceeding small;
> Though with patience he stands waiting,
> With exactness he grinds all."

Of course, as a result of the invention of the cotton gin, the market value of slaves and slave labor was greatly increased. A general change of opinion took place in the South as to the merits of slavery. Through commerce, manufactures, and political and ecclesiastical relations, the same change extended to the North. All ranks, all professions, all departments of business, were infected by this new poison. The warm heart of Christian philanthropy was chilled in this atmosphere of cruel and godless worldliness. By the year 1830, it

had become the fashion to defend slavery on its merits. "There had always been slavery and there always would be. It was a part of the divine order. It was sustained by the Bible. Moses was a slaveholder and Paul had returned fugitives. It was a good thing for the slave, who would be worse off if he were set free. Above all, it was very profitable." We had, at length, a remedy for the unprofitableness of cotton culture, but where was the remedy for this fearful demoralization? Who could deliver us from this degrading and apparently hopeless bondage to Mammon?

Mr. Webster said that he did not blame the South for this change of opinion—that all generations of men had been controlled by self-interest—that "all that had happened was natural." But Mr. Webster once remembered that some other things are natural—that conscience is natural—that hatred of oppression and sympathy with the oppressed are natural—that the fear of God and of his retribution is natural—that accumulated wrath over long-endured wrong is natural. In these forces, which Mr. Webster seemed to have forgotten, lay the remedy for the nation's debasement. God has provided, in the nature of things, an antidote for great evils—and the greater the evil, the

greater the antidote. The more burdensome and audacious the evil becomes, the more indignant and emphatic is the protest which the soul makes against it. The outraged moral nature of man is the tireless enemy which a giant wrong must ever confront, and from which it is never safe. The indignation of all honest men against a great crime soon finds stern expression, and, in the case of slavery, it found such expression through the early abolitionists. These men were just as really raised up of God to commence the attack upon slavery, as was Moses to lead his people out of Egypt, as was Paul to carry the Gospel to the Gentiles, as was Luther to lead the Reformation in Germany, or Knox to lead it in Scotland. They were a noble company. If we find in them, with many things to commend, some things to condemn; if they committed blunders as well as achieved successes—it will only show us that they were human, and very much like other bodies of reformers who have appeared in successive generations. I purpose to speak of some of the general qualities, commendable or otherwise, by which these men were characterized, and then to give you my personal recollections of some of them. Among our British ancestors, it was a custom

that when a hero died, each member of the tribe brought a stone to the cairn that was to perpetuate his memory. We must each do our part, however humble, in the making of history.

1. It would seem hardly necessary to say that the early abolitionists were men of *deep earnestness*. Indeed but for this quality there could not have been any early abolitionists. In them it was singularly strong and pure, and I well remember the fascination which it exerted upon the minds of many young men. The first thing which struck your attention, when you met them, was their honest and terrible indignation against slavery, and their unflagging purpose to use all means at command to accomplish its extinction. Nobody ever questioned their sincerity. They might be called "fanatics," "insane," "fools," "nuisances," but they were never suspected of any indirect motive—political, pecuniary, or social. Such a suspicion, under the circumstances, would have been absurd. It should be added that this earnestness had to a large extent, though I am sorry to say not always, the dignity and sweetness of Christian love. The early abolitionists had nearly all been trained in the church. Their idea of God's claims and of man's rights had come from their religious faith.

Their earnestness was that of prophets and apostles. They were not men of personal resentments. They fought a great crime and not individuals, although they doubtless made it uncomfortable enough for those who defended the crime. They shot their arrows at slavery, but the man who stood between it and them was likely enough to be hit. Mr. Garrison, after slavery was abolished, cordially welcomed to coöperation with himself in various reforms, all classes of worthy men, including those who had been his uncompromising antagonists. Saint George had killed the dragon, and the sword that had been weighted and sharpened only for it, was laid aside. The catholic spirit of his later years was often commended. George Thompson, when he was about to be discharged from prison, after a wearisome confinement of five years for the crime of trying to help his fellow-men to obtain their freedom—a crime of which he was doubtless guilty—says in his journal: "For the last time I collected the lambs and had another prayer-meeting. It was a blessed reviving season." These are not men of malice; they are men of righteousness and love. There were many early abolitionists of speech so severe that men thought them bitter in spirit to whom, as well as to Mr. Garri-

son, the words of Whittier were applicable:

> Not for thyself but for the slave
> Thy words of thunder shook the world;
> No selfish griefs or hatred gave
> The strength wherewith thy bolts were hurled.
>
> From lips that Sinai's trumpet blew
> We heard a tenderer undersong;
> Thy very wrath from pity grew,
> From love of man thy hate of wrong.

2. The earnestness of the early abolitionists was accompanied, as we should expect it would be, by a *genuine courage*. It has been said that any average man may be so trained that he will stand in the line of battle, and shoot and be shot at. But the highest courage requires in addition to this a cheerful and patient perseverance, and this comes only of consecration to a cause. Such a courage was that of the abolitionists. Most of them felt that it was of little consequence what happened to them so that the great object could be promoted. Cromwell, writing, after the battle of Marston-Moor, to Colonel Walton, says that, as young Walton, who was the Colonel's son, and Cromwell's nephew, lay dying on the battle-field from a wound by a cannon shot, he said to his uncle that he had a comfort which was above his pain, but that one thing lay upon his spirit, and that was, that God had not suffered

him to do any more execution upon His enemies. What was life or death in comparison with putting to flight the enemies of a good cause! This was the spirit of the early abolitionists. Like Arthur Tappan, they were willing to endure loss of trade, attacks upon their homes, and the spoiling of their goods; like Weld and Goodell and Gerrit Smith and Phillips and Abby Kelley and Douglass and Charles Burleigh and Dresser, they were ready to encounter mobs, and face stones and brickbats and fouler missiles, and meet blows and other forms of personal violence; like Garrison, they were prepared to be dragged through the street by a frenzied mob, expecting every moment to be put to death; like Prudence Crandall, they submitted to many ingeniously varied forms of annoyance, insult and injury; like Thompson, Work, and Burr in Missouri, and the Oberlin rescuers here, they cheerfully went to prison when they felt it was the Master's will; like Torrey, they were content, on the chance of saving a fellow-creature, to step down into the very throat of the leviathan of slavery and hear the iron jaws close forever behind them; like Lovejoy, they chose to stand until they were shot dead in defense of the liberty of the press. Time would fail me to tell of all the faithful

men who defied death, went to prison, suffered stripes, were hunted by mobs, were betrayed by friends, and endured the loss of all things because they remembered those in bonds as bound with them. In a word, there never was any nobler or purer courage than that of many of these men.

3. Again, it is abundantly implied in what has been said already, that the early abolitionists were *men of self-denial.* They could have acquired wealth or distinction in the different callings and professions, but they cheerfully sacrificed all that the world holds dear that they might open their mouths for the dumb, and plead the cause of the poor and needy. Mr. Garrison would, in my judgment, have been a more distinguished and influential political editor than Horace Greeley. Wendell Phillips, as a parliamentary orator, would have had as brilliant a career as Henry Clay or the elder Pitt, both of whom, in natural endowments, he strongly resembled. Charles Burleigh would have been at the head of his profession, that of the law, in almost any State of the Union. Edmund Quincy would have been as subtle and accomplished an essayist as Jeffrey. But these men turned their backs on these alluring prospects that they might identify themselves

with the cause of the despised slave. They felt that their powers belonged to God and humanity, and not to themselves.

4. And here I would speak more fully of the *intellectual force* that characterized these abolitionists. Regarded simply from this point of view, they were a remarkable company of men and women. It may well be doubted whether any cause was ever better equipped, as regards the intelligence and ability of its advocates, than the anti-slavery reform. Upon its list of prose writers such names as the imperial Garrison, the clear and earnest Goodell, the just and spirited Birney, Rogers, sententious and racy, the candid and statesmanlike Jay, the elegant and elevated Channing, the witty and pointed Quincy, the capable and effective managing editors, Oliver Johnson, Joshua Leavitt, Sidney Howard Gay, William H. Burleigh and Dr. Bailey, the Shakespearian Mrs. Stowe, Mrs. Chapman, the biographer of Harriet Martineau, and the classical Mrs. Child, of whom Lowell said, that though her heart, like the Nile, sometimes flooded her brain, it always left the region it had invaded the more fruitful. The poets of this cause were Whittier, Pierpont, and Lowell, with a strong claim to Longfellow. Some of its orators were Phillips, Weld,

Stanton, Bradburn, Charles C. Burleigh, Gerrit Smith, William Goodell, Cassius Clay, Alvan Stewart, Samuel Lewis, Cyrus M. Burleigh, Douglass, Remond, Garnet, Abby Kelley and Angelina Grimke—names which even now sound in our ears like the blast of a bugle. Were it not for a rule, which, in my embarrassment of riches, I have tried to observe, not to introduce into this paper men who were not in some sense professional abolitionists, I should have been glad to include in the last list the names of such Oberlin teachers as Finney, Thome, and Hudson. Those of you who remember the thunderstorm of wrath with which President Finney sometimes broke forth, for a few moments, against slavery; or who heard such an address from Professor Thome as that on "Learning and Liberty," or have read his description of the midnight scene among the colored people of Antigua when emancipation took place there; or who were present at any public debate where Professor Hudson engaged in the work of vivisection upon a pro-slavery politician—will appreciate what it cost me not to place these names on my roll of anti-slavery orators. But for the same rule, which I am in so much danger of breaking, I should add to this list the names of such men in public life as

Sumner, Chase, Giddings, Wade, Hale, and John Quincy Adams. It is but justice to a people still suffering from the effects of unchristian prejudice, to add that in the great anti-slavery conventions the colored orators I have named, and some others, took their full share of the work, and appeared to no disadvantage in comparison with the speakers of another race.

But the early abolitionists made mistakes, and had marked faults, and our attention will now be directed to some of these. It should be remembered, however, that these faults did not belong to the whole body of earnest abolitionists, perhaps not even to a majority of them. They did not exist in all of even the early abolitionists, but were perhaps sufficiently prevalent among them, especially among their leaders, to be somewhat characteristic. It may be further added, in the way of apology for these faults, that you will discover in them a family resemblance to the faults of all sturdy and aggressive reformers, which suggests the possibility of a common explanation of them all. It would, no doubt, be an excellent thing, if, when you have a tough piece of reformatory work to do, you could find a set of men with all possible qualifications for it, both positive and negative, and without any defects whatever.

But there may be some insuperable difficulty in the way of this. It may be, with the limitations upon our human nature, that when you have found men with the pluck, I may say the audacity, with the earnestness, with the absolute consecration to the work, with the stalwart force, with the strength of muscle and the weight of blow which the cause demands, this will turn out to be about all that they can furnish, and they will naturally be found to be somewhat deficient in the graces, the courtesies, the amenities, the sweetness, even the charities that we so much love. Nevertheless, defects or no defects, we must have these men. When fortresses, that have grown hoary in sheltering oppression, are to be torn down—when the light of day is to be let in on the dungeons of some Bastile, we must have men, first of all, who can poise and hurl battering-rams—who can plant explosives, who can wield battle-axes and smite with claymores; and if we find them deficient in the gentler qualities, or even, at times, in candor and fairness, we must look with some indulgence upon these defects, for the sake of the valor and the force which they bring to the aid of a good cause. I am indebted to President Fairchild for the defense made by an anti-slavery editor for harshness in

his methods: "I have a rough road to travel," he said, "and silk slippers wouldn't last me an hour." Who would blot from the page of history the influence of Martin Luther? and yet even that revered reformer is not heated much beyond his wont in controversy, when he shouts to some monkish antagonist, "I will break in pieces your heart of brass, and pulverize your iron brains." With the charitable consideration which this view of the case naturally begets, we will now discuss the faults of the early abolitionists.

1. In the first place, then, many of them had *a defective philosophy of morals.* They were honest to the core. Their sympathies were sound and manly. They loved righteousness and hated iniquity. But when they undertook to give us definitions, they threw us into confusion. They judged moral character by mechanical rules, and definitions derived from men's external acts and relations. For example, the holding of a slave is, in all possible circumstances—in its very nature—sinful. Did not John Wesley say that American slavery is the sum of all villainies? Did not Thomas Jefferson write that he trembled for his country when he remembered that God is just? Hence, to continue one hour voluntarily in the

relation of slaveholder, is in itself a deadly sin. Is it not so? Nay, more, is it not self-evidently so? This being the case, is not the man who apologizes for the slaveholder, though not himself one, plainly, and of necessity a sinner? If this be true, then the apologist for this man is also wicked, and so on, indefinitely. Let us dwell a moment upon this. A is a slaveholder, and therefore a criminal. B knows this, but apologizes for A; therefore B is a criminal. C admits that A is morally depraved, but thinks that B may be an honest man. As this is plainly wrong, C also is a sinner. Now comes D who condemns A and B, but as C is his neighbor, and he approves what he has seen of his spirit, he thinks that C may be upright. Now we must condemn D; and this process goes on to the end of the alphabet. So reasoned many of the early abolitionists. Of course this alphabet included all the world but themselves. Nay more, if one of themselves, in a moment of weakness, ventured to suggest that some man in the neighborhood of S or T might be virtuous, he was denounced and virtually excommunicated. It used to be said that no true abolitionist would think well of a man that would think well of a man that would think well of a man that would think

well of a slaveholder. Now this rule was, in some respects, a very convenient one. It was simple and easily applied. It saved much trouble in thinking and investigating. When you met a man you were under no necessity of observing his conduct, studying his spirit, or listening to the testimony of his neighbors. You only needed to know that he stood somewhere in the line from A to Z. But while this rule saved time and trouble, it had its disadvantages. In the first place, it made the righteous too few in number for cheerful labor among themselves. It was bad in itself, being founded neither in good sense, right reason, nor experience. It produced unnecessary friction, divided true men, and weakened their power for good. There can be no doubt that this error did much to retard the success of the cause, and success which would have come in the best way, by the wide diffusion and candid reception of truth.

2. But I have been anticipating another fault of many of these reformers which was that of *intolerance*. They could not bear a difference of opinion. It did seem to them so perverse and unreasonable that their opinions upon moral questions should not at once be accepted by all! This fault was in part intellectual, resulting from

that lack of a philosophy of morals of which I have spoken, and in part moral, the fruit of bitterness which had been produced by the long contest. It must be admitted that the early abolitionists had much to try their patience. When they started out with the inspiration of a new cause, they expected large help from the political parties and the church. A few public men gave them a little indirect countenance. A considerable number of Christian people did join them. But the church, as a whole, like the parties, stood aloof, honestly in doubt, let us hope, as to the wisdom and usefulness of the movement. This cold reception was a great disappointment to the reformers, and when to this was added the social ostracism, the abuse, and the cruel persecutions of subsequent years, it does not surprise us to find that they became harsh and embittered. I put it to your candor, whether an abolitionist of the proper temperament could be expected to control his feelings when one of the most powerful ecclesiastical bodies in the country refused to consider his petition on the subject of slavery, declined to adopt vigorous testimonies against it, repealed old testimonies because they were too vigorous, and took an apologetic attitude generally towards that iniquity, and then proceeded to

discuss and condemn the sin of dancing and the evil of marrying a deceased wife's sister. Is it surprising that abolitionists went about saying in their bitterness that, according to the canons of this church, if you dance with a woman, or marry a woman who is your sister-in-law, you will be under censure, but if you sell a woman into perpetual slavery, you will escape it? I always thought it a grave error in the church to give the new reform so inhospitable a reception, and it was wrong in the abolitionists to permit themselves, in consequence of this rebuff, to become denunciatory and uncharitable.

In some instances this practice of denunciation degenerated into a mere habit of scolding. I recall an example of this which had an unexpected result. As it introduces a name even more distinguished than that of the principal actor, it may be of some interest to you. It was probably in the winter of 1860, when two gentlemen, known as Mr. Cox and Mr. Garfield, were, like myself, members of the Ohio Senate, that a lady who had been a prominent anti-slavery lecturer of an extreme school, came to Columbus, as it was understood, to reprove the members of the General Assembly, in personal interviews, for their shortcomings in the work

of reform. She sat with some friends upon the floor of the Senate, in a part reserved for ladies, and sent for Senators, one by one, to exhort them. Cox and myself, as I remember, had both responded to her summons, had received our reproofs with due meekness, and had returned to our seats with something, no doubt, of that humbled look which a man always has, owing, of course, to his false education, when he is put down by a woman. Garfield's turn came next. He had a keen relish for fun, and some curiosity was expressed to learn the result of the encounter. As he approached our critic, and before she could fairly begin, he broke out with much emphasis somehow as follows:—"Oh, madam! I hail this opportunity. I have long wished to see you in order to rebuke you; and I do now rebuke you for your horrible treason to humanity. How can you look us in the face, after all the harm you have done to the cause of reform? Oh, madam! I've seen hard-hearted people, I've seen cruel people, I've seen malicious people—but of all the hard-hearted people, all the cruel people, all the malicious people that I ever saw, you are the most incorrigible. I denounce you in the name of bleeding humanity for your abominable course." This jocose tirade had the intended effect. The

lady felt herself outscolded and declined the contest. Mr. Garfield, like the skillful military man which he afterwards showed himself to be, drew off his forces without loss. Having given this ludicrous incident, it is but justice to add that the lady in question was one of the most laborious, faithful, and self-denying of the group of workers to which she belonged. I knew her well, and often heard her. She was a thorough student of her subject, and was one of the best furnished of all the anti-slavery speakers with facts, illustrations, and arguments. Her public addresses were often very able, and, in the early period, wholly unobjectionable. But as the years passed, she became impatient with the slow progress which the world was making. She felt that the case had been made so plain that further argument was a waste of strength, and the time had come for denunciation and the application of the severest epithets. Henceforth her speeches were composed largely, and I have no doubt conscientiously, of material of this kind.

3. I must speak of one more fault of a portion of the early anti-slavery men, and one which was a great obstacle to their success. They were prone to attack the wrong thing. When they assaulted slavery, or those who

upheld slavery, they were in their legitimate sphere, and commended themselves strongly to men's conscience and judgment. But they could not limit themselves to this. For example, in discussing national questions, they began by showing that the government of the United States, although founded, at great cost, for the establishment of liberty, had been administered in the interest of slavery. They turned a strong light upon all the dark places of our history, exposing the malign schemes by which slaveholders and their allies, for thirty years, had managed to subordinate the welfare of the whole people to the aggrandizement of a despotic oligarchy. This was excellent and wholesome work, and it secured for them a multitude of sympathizers. But this policy in time lost its interest for them, as being too elementary and common-place. It was time for advanced opinions. Hence they announced the doctrine that the Constitution, which all the great jurists are now agreed is a law, and is to be interpreted as such, was a mere treaty between independent States, and as they thought there were some things in it favorable to slavery, they demanded its abrogation, or became disunionists. By this step alone they lost a large portion of their followers. But a few of them went still

further. Believing that all reform must make progress, they next took the ground that human government is in its nature oppressive—that its use of force is brutal and unphilosophical—that the restraints which it imposes upon the mind, cripple and dwarf it, and fit it for the advocacy of slavery—that all government by force is, in its nature, pro-slavery. A similar course was pursued in regard to the church. The first abolitionists attacked the pro-slavery action of the churches, and criticised their lukewarmness and indifference. They placed the noble—the divine—ideal of self-denial and Christian philanthropy which the New Testament gives us, both in doctrine and example, side by side with the very imperfect illustrations of it which the church furnished in the body of her communicants. But that was a good and useful and Christian thing to do. It awakened in the churches a godly jealousy that did them good like a medicine. But a few of the reformers tired of this policy as being too slow, and fell to studying church organization. They were soon able to announce the discovery that this, even in its simpler forms, was oppressive to the membership, and thus, in spirit, pro-slavery. They then commenced, in the name of liberty, an attack upon

the church itself. I attended an anti-slavery meeting in Boston in which at least one speaker avowed the doctrine that slavery could not be abolished until the church had been destroyed. I well remember the reply of Wendell Phillips to this speech. He spoke of the absurdity of the position viewed merely as a matter of policy. He said: "It is as if I were driving upon the highway in the White Mountains and found the road obstructed by a rock that had fallen upon it from the heights, and instead of getting men and crowbars to roll it over the precipice out of my way, I should insist upon sitting stock-still until I had invented some universal solvent that would melt all the granite of New England, or rather of the whole globe that we inhabit. In my judgment that would be a slow way to reach the end of the journey, to say nothing of the question whether we can afford to lose the granite."

I am glad to repeat that these extreme views in regard to the government and the church, were adopted by only a minority of the early abolitionists, although in this minority were found the names of persons of wide influence.

Some personal recollections of the early abolitionists will form the subject of a future lecture.

THE EARLY ABOLITIONISTS.

II.

PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS.

A THURSDAY LECTURE.

AN introductory address, delivered a few months since, has prepared the way for giving you my recollections of some leaders among the early abolitionists. You will pardon so much of personal history as may be necessary to justify my undertaking to speak, in some measure, for these men. As early as the year 1840, I occasionally addressed temperance and anti-slavery meetings. From October 10, 1841, until February, 1844—a few weeks before I came to Oberlin to enter college—I was constantly employed in the service of the American Anti-Slavery Society, or some other organization of like character. The first certificate of official appointment which I find among my papers, is dated at "New York, First Month, 5th, 1842," and is signed by James S. Gibbons, Chairman, and Isaac T. Hopper, Treasurer of

the American Anti-Slavery Society. During the nearly two and a third years in which I was engaged in anti-slavery work, I must have delivered several hundred addresses. While I cannot accuse myself of any want of earnestness and sincerity in these labors, I cannot, in candor, claim for them any high degree of effectiveness in the advancement of the cause. There must have been much that was crude in thought, unsound in philosophy, and ill-advised in judgment in the utterance of an uneducated and inexperienced youth of twenty. But while it must be admitted that the service which I rendered was not very valuable, it is some relief to remember that the compensation which I received for it was not excessive. I was comfortably fed and decently clothed during the whole period, and reached Oberlin, soon after its close, with a net sum of seventy-five dollars in gold in my pocket. Let me gratefully add that I found in the anti-slavery field some advantages more important than money. I was at the age when the powers of observation are quickest and most vigorous, and when the eye and ear are never tired of taking in what man and nature offer them. I was enabled to see something of my own country in different States, and to observe different phases of American society. The excitement

upon the question of slavery commonly made my audiences large and interesting, and if they occasionally furnished a man who threw missiles at my head, it is only fair to remember that they had to listen to my speeches. It was my privilege frequently to see and hear eminent men among the early abolitionists, and to have some acquaintance with them. My personal recollections of them and of their surroundings are very vivid, and the humble part which I bore among them fitted me, I trust, in some degree, for the duty I have assumed to-day.

My recollections of these pioneers of reform, in one instance, go much further back than the time I have spoken of. It was in the autumn of 1828, that a man came to the door of our farmhouse in Connecticut, and, in the gentlest tones, invited my mother to aid him in some work in which, as it seemed to me, who was a witness of the interview, he felt a deep interest. The picture which has remained impressed upon my mind is that of a slight man, having the appearance of an invalid, with a face that looked weary, sad, and earnest. The appeal to my boyish sympathies was strengthened by his lifting his hand to his ear and asking my mother to speak distinctly as he was partially deaf. I suffered a childish disappointment when my

mother told him that she was not prepared to render him any assistance. So much I distinctly remember as having happened at the time. I afterwards came to know that this man was Benjamin Lundy, the Quaker philanthropist, and that he had asked my mother that day to subscribe for his paper, the "Genius of Universal Emancipation." I think we all felt later a sympathetic regret at having failed to help a good man in a cause that would have brought a blessing. Mr. Lundy was the first man who dared to attack slavery after its growing profitableness had firmly established it in the popular favor. He was not a great man intellectually, and did not see his way clear as to principles and measures. But he was one of the truest, gentlest, bravest, most unselfish, forgiving, and patient souls that ever lived. For the sake of the slave, he bore endless hardship, poverty and persecution without one complaint. To me he seems a rare spirit—a constant sufferer for Christ who talks only of mercies and blessings experienced—a man in daily battle with evil who is charitable to the authors of it—a reformer who often attributes his want of success to his own deficiencies. In the autumn of 1828 and 1829, he traveled, mostly on foot, with a heavy knapsack on his back, through the

Eastern States, delivering lectures, soliciting subscriptions for his journal, and visiting clergymen and other leaders of public opinion. In Boston, he tells us, he found "the very winter of philanthropy." But there was already a promise of spring. At his boarding-house, he found a young man by the name of Garrison, who expressed hearty sympathy with his object. "If I mistake not," he says, "this young man will yet be heard from." Mr. Garrison's own acknowledgment of his indebtedness to Mr. Lundy refers to this period, and is equally creditable to both. "If I have, in any way, however humble," he says, "done anything toward calling attention to slavery, or bringing about the glorious prospect of a complete jubilee in our country at no distant day, I feel that I owe everything in this matter, instrumentally, and under God, to Benjamin Lundy."

When we reach the name of Mr. Garrison, we find the true originator of the modern anti-slavery movement. I know that his claim to this merit has been contested; but the dreary, special pleading in which it is done reminds us of the attempt to prove that Columbus was not the real discoverer of America—that Luther did not give us the Reformation—that the dramas of Shakespeare were written by Bacon—and

that Newton was not the discoverer of the universal gravitation of matter. Mr. Garrison was, no doubt, the first man, in the recent period, who announced the doctrine of immediate emancipation. But it is more that his clarion voice first commanded general attention. He pricked the conscience, awakened the intellect, and stirred the sensibilities of the nation. He made slavery a subject of discussion in every town and by every fireside. His powers were most effectively exerted through his writings; but he was a remarkable speaker, and would have been thought still more remarkable but for his brilliant success with the pen. In speaking, his style was terse, clear, and vigorous, and animated throughout by intense earnestness. His clear-cut sentences had each great completeness in themselves, so that they produced the effect of aphorisms. As they fell from his lips, they reminded the hearer of the dropping of sovereigns upon a counter—so solid, so perfect, so plainly stamped, and often so beautiful they seemed. When at his best he spoke with a weight of authority that produced a certain awe in the hearer, recalling the Athenian orator's definition of eloquence—δεινότης, *terribleness*. He had a prophet-like solemnity, as of one who had been sent to call men to account for

their sins—to denounce judgments upon oppression and disobedience to God. This impression was heightened by the fervor and aptness with which he quoted the noblest passages from the prophets and the Psalms. I never thought of him as an orator, but as one who had come to instruct, to warn, and to judge. But when heated in debate with a strong man, his manner changed, and did not impress me so favorably. An element of fierceness was added to it. At such times he was a dangerous foe, and few who encountered him had reason to congratulate themselves on the result. He spoke as if his opponent were guilty of intolerable presumption, and must be promptly suppressed. He would neither give nor take quarter. He aimed to get within the weapon of his antagonist and to close with him in mortal combat.

A notable example of this was a debate which I heard at a great Reform Convention in Boston in February, 1844, between Mr. Garrison and that able, versatile, impulsive, irascible, imperious man, Orestes A. Brownson—a debate which attracted much attention at the time, and in which, I must say, Mr. Brownson was utterly put down. A somewhat milder but still characteristic instance of the same sort belongs to a time a few months earlier. An

account of this may be of some interest to you in itself, but of more interest as an illustration of the manner in which the anti-slavery conflict was often conducted. On the 10th of July, 1843, I attended an anti-slavery convention in Springfield, Massachusetts. Mr. Garrison and one other speaker were also there. Dr. Osgood, the esteemed and already venerable pastor of the First Congregational Church in that town, was present at the meetings. He had formerly been connected with the abolition movement, but, disturbed by what he thought to be some of its tendencies, he had withdrawn from it. He and Mr. Garrison seemed each, I thought, to recognize an adversary in the other from the beginning. They soon fell into debate. Mr. Garrison said that the Congregational churches of New England were in sympathy with the slaveholding churches of the South, and were responsible for the crime of slavery. Dr. Osgood replied that this charge was false, for the churches of New England had no ecclesiastical connection with Southern churches. Thereupon Mr. Garrison kindled, and grew intense, tenacious, and incisive. Of course, I cannot reproduce his words with the exception of a few phrases that burnt into my memory; but the principal points of his argument, so strong was

the impression made upon me, have never been forgotten. Mr. Garrison said in substance that he cared but little about the merely formal relation between the New England churches and those of the South. He wished to know whether there was an identity of spirit between them. Was the religion of the two sections the same? He then read, probably from the old "Boston Recorder," or possibly from the "Vermont Chronicle"—both of which were then organs of Congregationalism—an editorial congratulating all Christian readers on a revival of religion that had prevailed among Presbyterians in one of the Gulf States—perhaps in Mississippi. It had been a marvelous work of grace; the hearts of master and slave had alike been touched; and the good influence had been widely felt. Now what was this religion which had thus been revived, and over the revival of which the Congregationalists of New England so much rejoiced. Southern newspapers published in the State and even in the neighborhood where this revival had occurred, and daily received in Boston offices, by way of exchange, contained numerous instances of the barbarities practiced in that region—advertisements of fugitive slaves in which are described, to aid in the identification of their persons, the scarred backs, the

maimed feet, the crippled hands, the branded bosoms, the slashed faces, the mutilated eyes and ears, and all the familiar evidences of the state of slavery—advertisements of masters of trained bloodhounds which they will let on reasonable terms to pursue and seize these crippled and unhappy men and women—advertisements of slave-auctions where husbands, wives, parents and children will be sold separately, or in lots, to suit purchasers. What share had these owners of mutilated slaves, these masters of bloodhounds, these auctioneers of human beings in this revival? Were they leaders in the movement? Were they converted during its progress? If so, what evidence had they given of penitence for the atrocities they had committed? If it should be said, that these classes were all outside of this revival work, then it might be asked whether there was any man of those that were engaged in it, whether there was any one of the clergymen who conducted it, that would stand up in his place and rebuke these outrages upon humanity? Was the Gospel which these men had preached one that could live comfortably and peaceably with such atrocities, or one that would condemn and attack them? Would any one claim that the subjects of this revival had even thought of such

a thing as a conflict with these giant crimes? And yet, Dr. Osgood and his Congregational brethren thanked God for such a revival as this; and should there ever be such a thing as a revival in Dr. Osgood's church, no doubt the Presbyterian slaveholders of Mississippi would thank God for that also. Both these parties had the same religion, and that religion was essentially pro-slavery. Such was, in substance, Mr. Garrison's argument. I did not then, and do not now, think it altogether fair, for it does not make sufficient allowance for the influence upon judgment and conscience, of remoteness and indirectness in human relations. But it carried the large audience with it, and it sorely perplexed good Dr. Osgood, who looked as if he were trying to quote something from Dr. Wayland's "Limitations of Human Responsibility" —a book then fresh in everybody's mind—but could not quite remember what it was.

An incident occurred that day, at the close of the session, which I mention, because it was a characteristic example of Mr. Garrison's frankness. Dr Osgood, approaching the part of the hall where Mr. Garrison and myself were standing together, without seeming to observe him, said to me, with a motive which I did not fail to appreciate, "You showed good sense in

your speech. You had argument and candor." As soon as Mr. Garrison and I were by ourselves, he said: "Be not seduced by this smooth-tongued man. He complimented your speech, not because he thought it so good an effort, but because he wished to disparage those of us who had dealt with him more thoroughly." I think you will agree with me that, if I had been in any danger of being spoiled by Dr. Osgood's praise, this would have been a sufficient antidote.

I must not leave the impression that the early abolitionists always came off as well as on this occasion in their encounters with doctors of divinity. Of the old-fashioned divines who still lingered in the New England parishes, in my boyhood, there were some who, well-informed, shrewd, wary, and full of mother wit, were a match for any lecturer who might come into their neighborhood. As my own experience furnishes an instance of discomfiture from such a source, it is, perhaps, only reasonable that I should give you this rather than make an example of another man. It was probably in November, 1841, that I had an appointment to speak in Thompson, Connecticut. The meeting was to be held in the Congregational Church where the venerable Dr. Dow had ministered

for many years. When I reached the house, Dr. Dow was there, and he sat with me in the pulpit. I remember nothing unusual in my address. It is presumable that I spoke of the evil of slavery, of our political, ecclesiastical, commercial, and social complicity with it, and of the duty of all Northern men—and of the citizens of Thompson in particular—to unite in resisting its encroachments and thus preparing the way for its abolition. When I sat down, Dr. Dow rose. I wish I could give you his dry, solemn, half-paternal manner. He said, in substance, "I have listened attentively to the young man's speech. His zeal is commendable, but the appeal which he made seems hardly pertinent to this locality. I might convey my idea to you by an illustration. Let us suppose that I am asleep in my bed in the middle of the night. I am awakened by a clamor and a knocking at my window. I spring to my feet, and ask, what is the matter. I recognize the voice of this young gentleman in response, 'Dr. Dow, there is a fire. Fire! fire!' 'Young man,' I ask, 'is the fire on this street?' 'No! fire! fire!' 'Is the fire anywhere on Thompson hill?' 'No! fire! fire!' 'Well, is the fire in the State of Connecticut?' 'No! fire! fire!' Growing impatient, I exclaim, 'Well,

young man, where *is* the fire?' At last the answer comes, 'Why, Dr. Dow, the fire is in Lou-is-i-a-ny!'" As the Doctor concluded, the old church rang with peals of laughter. I thought they would never stop laughing. Of course, I tried to recover myself. I said, "Let us carry the supposition a little further. Suppose that instead of a single fire in Louisiana there was a system of fires. Suppose a system of arson was practiced throughout the Southern States. Suppose we were, in part, responsible for it, and our money and influence had contributed to it. Nay, more, suppose an attempt were made to extend this curse into the North—into Connecticut. Would Dr. Dow, would any man, have a right to complain if he were entreated to join in an effort to arrest its progress? Should he not rather be thankful if he were called upon, at any hour of the day or night, and warned of the coming danger?" This I said, and doubtless much more. It was all in vain. I could not even get a hearing. I was laughed at as each successive sentence was delivered. The whole question was considered too ridiculous for serious thought. The meeting closed with much merry feeling in all hearts but one.

But it is time to ask your attention to another

name among the early abolitionists. The prince of all anti-slavery orators—I had almost said, the prince of all the orators I have ever known—was Wendell Phillips. His natural graces and endowments, his fine culture and many acquisitions, and the elevated moral purpose which wielded these simply as means to noble ends—all contributed to his matchless eloquence. His handsome person, his finely chiselled, classical features, his expressive face, his graceful action, his gesture that sent the thought home, his musical and magnetic voice, his simple, natural, and charming elocution, his unlimited command of pure English, and his quickness in choosing instantly the best word for his object—a word that came hot to his lips, the elevated thought and the fine contagious enthusiasm that stirred his whole being—these were some of the elements of that power that kept great audiences hanging on his lips with no sense of the lapse of time. His earnestness was a sustained glow, like that of molten metal, with an occasional flash that went through you like an electric shock. His humor played for a moment like heat lightning on a summer cloud, and then struck, and burnt. Mr. Phillips was never described by the reporters and reviewers

as being a logical speaker. I do not remember to have seen the familiar epithet "argumentative" applied to his efforts, and do not suppose they suggested it. He was impatient of the slow, syllogistic processes. Such terms as "major premise," "minor premise," "a priori," "a posteriori"—I might almost add "therefore" and "consequently"—he never used. What he saw and felt he was very apt to take for granted. "Heat, not light," he said, "was what men wanted." And yet he always carried the understanding of his hearers as truly as he stirred their emotions. As you listened to him you felt no want of truth or soundness in his discourse. His speeches were a succession of propositions that appeared so nearly self-evident that you were only too glad to accept them and move on to the coming triumph. His power of statement was wonderful. He saw so clearly and felt so strongly, this could not be otherwise. His simple sentences gave you so vivid a picture of his thought, that you recognized it as something which you already knew, and with which you certainly could sympathize. It was interesting to compare his mental processes with those of orators who were able indeed but who delighted in the slower methods of reasoning in detail. They reminded me of men

who climb some Alpine peak by slow and toilsome means, lifting themselves painfully from point to point and from crevice to crevice, dragging after them the surveyor's chain, keeping record of altitudes, temperature, and atmospheric density, and at last achieving success. But Phillips seemed like one who, glancing upward for a moment to fix his course, unfolds the wings of his genius, and lights on the heights from above. The man of routine may say that he has reached it by irregular methods, but cannot deny that he is there.

The newspapers used to speak of the patrician bearing of Mr. Phillips. If he had such bearing, it was most natural and unpretending. No doubt, he stood upon the platform like a cultivated, self-respecting, Christian gentleman. At one time the fashionable people of Boston undertook to stigmatize abolitionism as vulgar. But it was not possible for all Boston to make abolitionism vulgar so long as Wendell Phillips advocated it. His blood was as blue as any that ran in Massachusetts veins, and it was not easy for the sons and daughters of men who had sold codfish and molasses within his memory, to look down upon him. The young men of Boston who listened to Mr. Phillips felt that, if they took

sides with him, they would be keeping as good company as Boston could furnish, and his eloquence drew many of them to the anti-slavery organization.

It has been said that Mr. Phillips, as the years advanced with him, lost something of his old fire. I know not how this may have been, but it is probably true that his best efforts were made in the height of the early anti-slavery movement, when he was in the prime of his powers, and when passing events made the strongest appeal to a nature so generous as his. Unfortunately these speeches were not properly reported. The volume of his published lectures contains nothing between 1837 and 1851. In a letter received not long before his death, in reply to one of inquiry from me, he says that his anti-slavery addresses of this early time are nowhere to be found except in such brief reports as were contained in the newspapers of the day, and that, believing the interest in them died with the occasion, he had never tried to recover them. I deeply regret this. It has always appeared to me that there never could have been any better platform oratory of the higher order than were these speeches. If eloquence means the power to capture immense assemblies of the people of various opinions

and prejudices, and hold them, as one man, in sympathy with the speaker, then these speeches were eloquent.

I heard Mr. Phillips many times and always with profit and delight. Of one of these occasions, in such imperfect manner as is now possible to me, I must try to give you some account. Although I cannot reproduce, with verbal accuracy, a single sentence that was uttered in this address, and have only the vaguest remembrance of the course of thought, yet so vivid is the impression that it left upon my mind that I cannot believe I am quite the same man I should have been, had I never heard it. This speech must, I think, have been made at one of the conventions of the New England Anti-Slavery Society. It was delivered to an immense popular assembly at an evening meeting in Fanueil Hall. For some reason which I do not now distinctly remember, there was great political excitement in connection with this meeting. It was attended by a large body of "roughs" from certain wards in the city of Boston, who came, apparently instructed by their leaders, to dispute everything and to be generally disorderly and violent. They stood compactly together in one part of the hall, and were from the beginning defiant and noisy.

Early in the evening the impression on the platform was that no speaker could gain a hearing in an assembly so turbulent, and that it would soon break up in a dangerous riot. At length, however, the meeting was supposed to be organized, and an attempt was made to carry out the programme of the evening; but one speaker after another who began to address the audience, was silenced by a storm of yells, groans, and hisses. A distinguished colored man was then put forward in the hope that the mob might feel an interest in listening to him, but the bellowing of the thousand-headed monster was only redoubled. It was said upon the platform that Mr. Phillips must next try the experiment, and he promptly responded. Stepping swiftly and lightly to the front, he made a slight deprecatory gesture as if he had a suggestion to present, or a word of explanation to offer, or possibly a compromise to propose. As he began, it was evident that he had caught the attention of the multitude. In thinking of it now, I am reminded of the great silence which Paul made by beckoning with his hand. When Mr. Phillips had spoken for two or three minutes, in the spirit of what Cicero would call the *conciliatio*, the monster toward the rear of the hall grew restless and

threatened another outbreak; but, lifting his finger, as if he would say "just a word more," he proceeded. In a few moments it was plain that the turbulent spirits were falling under his control. Bucephalus had been mounted by his master. Soon we were all alike hurried along by the torrent of his discourse. The glowing eye, the sweet, sympathetic, half-tremulous voice, the action at once persuasive and forcible, the form that seemed to dilate with the rising enthusiasm, the body over which spiritual feeling seemed so to dominate that you lost the sense of a corporeal presence—these all now exercised their charm upon men of every class and every grade of culture. I can give but little account of what was said during the hour that followed. I only know that there was humor, pathos, terse statement, earnest appeal, elevated sentiment, and manly reproof. There was, of course, the metaphor that was both a picture and an argument; the single word that raised a blister on the thick skin of hunkerism; the spark of wit that looked innocent but was dangerous; the flash of light that revealed, for a moment, even to those who would not see, all the creeping things that hide in the recesses of a vulgar, selfish, prejudiced heart; the call to the dead moral nature of man

that woke it to conscious life and terror; and, towards the close, there was the divine frenzy which pervaded all these and made them irresistible. The mob continued to be charmed auditors to the end. They permitted him, without interruption, to say to them, and of them, and of their masters what he saw fit, and when he concluded, and the immense assembly, after taking a moment to bethink itself, joined in a grand outburst of applause, many of the mob appeared to applaud with the rest. It was a great triumph and it was eloquence, if there ever was any.

One of the ablest, most laborious, and and most useful of the early anti-slavery workers was Charles C. Burleigh. He came of a remarkable family, and was himself the most remarkable member of it. I knew him almost from boyhood, and have always regarded him as an excellent example of the earnest, brave, hard-working, upright, and unselfish reformer. He showed great ability in whatever way he labored, whether as editor, lecturer, or financial agent; but his chief merit was, no doubt, that of a speaker. He must have delivered thousands of public addresses, in many different States, during his long service in the anti-slavery cause. His ordinary speeches,

given from town to town, were never poor. They were clear, instructive, and often very interesting; but it detracted much from their effectiveness that he had a curious fancy for spending the first half of his hour in an elaborate effort to prove self-evident truths—or truths, at least, which his audience were all prepared to admit. His friends spoke frankly to him of this habit, but he could not be broken of it. He had the feeling that he must go back to the beginning, and get a good start. During the last half of his addresses, he would become roused and hold the fixed attention of his hearers. But those who would know what Charles Burleigh was must have heard him in debate with a man whose powers were fairly matched with his own. He was, I think, the greatest debater that the anti-slavery movement produced. Opposition made him a new man. No matter how dull a speech he might be making, let but some one rise in the assembly—some lawyer of eminence, some distinguished clergyman—and ask him a few well-put questions, and there was an instant change. Power, from somewhere within, came into the eyes and into the face. The leonine head, with its ample environment of auburn hair, then looked defiant and terrible like an antique bust of some old Roman, great in war

or in the councils of the State. In such conflicts, or in more formal ones, all that he had ever known seemed available, and his disciplined powers were at their best, and were all at command. He not only refuted all hostile objections, but put his antagonist on the defensive, and commonly so utterly vanquished him that the audience, whatever its prejudices might have been, would concede the victory to Mr. Burleigh. His replies to opponents, struck out in the heat of debate, were often very noble. Some of these it was my privilege to hear. Of another, which I believe has never appeared in print, I must give you an account which I received from a friend. It was, perhaps, in the year 1839, that Charles Burleigh, by previous arrangement of the friends of the parties, had a debate, in some town in Southern Pennsylvania, with a gentleman of character and ability, who, if I remember correctly, was a Dr. Smucher, of the Lutheran College in Gettysburg. This debate lasted a couple of days, and was a famous event in its time. As it was held near the Maryland line, the duties of citizens under the old Fugitive Slave Law of 1793 were naturally a prominent subject of discussion. Dr. Smucher, in support of his conservative opinions, quoted, unfortunately as it would now seem, the text

"Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." Mr. Burleigh promptly replied:—"I, too, would render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; but the learned doctor seems to have forgotten the circumstances under which these words of our Lord were spoken. The Pharisees asked him, 'Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar, or not?' But he said unto them, 'Bring me a penny that I may see it.' And they brought it. And he saith unto them, 'Whose image and superscription hath it?' They say unto him Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, 'Render therefore unto Cæsar the the things which be Cæsar's and unto God the things which be God's.' So would I say in regard to the fugitive slave, 'Whose image and superscription hath he?' 'And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him.' Render therefore unto God the things which be God's."

The great humorist of the early anti-slavery speakers was Alvan Stewart, of Utica, New York. As I remember him, he was, I should

say, more than six feet in height, with proportions otherwise suitable—a large-headed, broad-shouldered, big-bodied man. His ample face was, when in repose, one of the most solemn and melancholy that I ever saw, and it did not depart much from this type when he was uttering witticisms that convulsed everybody else with laughter. At a meeting of the Connecticut Anti-Slavery Society held at New Haven in the summer of 1842, I heard a speech from him which his friends told me was a fair expression of his peculiar powers. The circumstances were these:—Gerrit Smith had published an address to the slaves of the South in which he had said to them that if they should run away from their masters, and in their attempts to reach the North, should find a boat, or a horse, or any other means of locomotion necessary to their escape, they would be wholly justified in taking it. This course of Mr. Smith wounded the moral sense of the "New York Observer." That religious journal had been able, for many years, to bear, with an equanimity approaching complacency, all the horrors and atrocities of slavery; but here was something which no pious soul could endure, and the "Observer," at last, found something to reprove. It was generally understood, though I do not

remember that I had personal knowledge of the fact, that it had published a leader severely attacking Mr. Smith, headed by the very proper question, "Is it right to steal?" These facts were the basis of Mr. Stewart's speech on the occasion to which I have referred. You can imagine what an opportunity they offered to a man in whom the feelings and the language of humorous sarcasm commanded a scale of range so wide as was hardly witnessed in any other man of his generation. The convention set apart an evening for a speech from Mr. Stewart. The house was packed. After some preliminary exercises the imposing form of the distinguished Utica lawyer was seen steering into place in front of the assembly like a seventy-four gun ship. He took his attitude, and settled his countenance. The audience cheered him merely for the face which he made. But he was not yet ready to proceed. His great frame was trembling with some internal commotion. Some profound thought was struggling for utterance. At length, when expectation was at its height, he found a voice. He asked us in a tone of sanctimonious melancholy which was inimitable, whether we thought it right to steal. This was greeted with a burst of laughter, and from that

time, for more than an hour, he kept the audience in a state of rapturous delight. Every few moments, after completing some climax of merriment, he would again inquire in a tone of hurt moral feeling, "Is it right to steal?" The palpable and ludicrous inconsistency of the "Observer" was, of course, the inspiration of the speech. Men gave way to a perfect abandon of laughter. They laughed, they cried, they applauded. But through all the uproar of applause, as well as through the moments of comparative quiet, was heard the voice of the speaker remonstrating in tones of plaintive sanctity against the wickedness of stealing—especially such shameful stealing as that recommended by Gerrit Smith. The doctrines and principles of the abolitionists were often made a subject of ridicule, but it must be admitted that their opponents gained but little advantage in the contest of wit and sarcasm.

At the same convention where Alvan Stewart spoke, I heard an address from Beriah Green, full of a noble courage and vigor. The only thing which I distinctly remember is that he quoted the whole or a part of Carlyle's translation of Luther's Hymn. It was new to me then, and I heartily sympathized with the half-military ardor with which it inspired the assembly.

I often attended meetings with Charles Lenox Remond, a colored man and a popular orator. He was not so strong a man as Frederick Douglass, but with good ability and many interesting experiences, he had a most attractive elocution.

William Goodell, one of the truest and noblest of the early anti-slavery men, I did not hear until after I came to Oberlin. I remember sitting with the lamented Professor Hudson in the old chapel and enjoying his grand utterances. I have in memory a picture of this earnest Christian reformer standing upon the platform and exhorting us to be prepared for the coming of Christ. Gazing into the far distance with the rapt look of a seer, he exclaimed: "Be ready for His coming! Already I can hear the rumbling of His chariot wheels in the distant mountain tops."

I was never so fortunate as to hear Theodore D. Weld; but I constantly met those who had heard him, and all reports justified Dr. Lyman Beecher's description of his eloquence as "logic on fire." There were other men of great merit among these pioneers of freedom of whose work I had more or less knowledge, and of whom it would be gratifying to speak, did time permit.

It has been pleasant to me to linger among these memories; but I must not delay too long. There have never been wanting those who would criticise and assail the early abolitionists. More rarely have they found eulogists or defenders. For this reason, it has been the greater satisfaction to me to dwell specially upon the great qualities, intellectual and moral, which adorned their lives and still illuminate their memories. Time, however, is slowly doing them justice. It is softening the popular estimate of their faults, and making more distinct their remarkable merits. But it is still a commendable labor to inculcate a gracious appreciation of their worth, for many a day must yet elapse before there will be any danger that the world will think better of them than they deserve.

THE EARLY ABOLITIONISTS.

III.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNION LIBRARY ASSOCIATION OF OBERLIN COLLEGE.

I KNEW Frederick Douglass exceedingly well. It began on this wise. In the summer of 1841, fifty-six years ago next summer, I went from my home in Connecticut to Millbury, Massachusetts, to attend an anti-slavery convention. There, for the first time, I met Mr. Douglass. I was just twenty years of age. He was about four years older, and had been three years out of slavery. This was the first occasion, beyond the limits of my own county, when I spoke at a public meeting, and Mr. Douglass was just beginning to address large audiences. I had some conversation with him, and liked him from the first. The tall, straight, well-built youth, with a strong head, eyes and face full of humor, and a certain frank manliness of

bearing, won from me, at once, a kindly esteem which grew in strength for more than half a century, and until I read in the morning journal that he had been suddenly called to his reward. When I saw him at Millbury, I did not know that he was a great man; but even then there was something in his manner of thought and expression, that might have led me to suspect it. He was genial and affable and prone to laugh at his own deficiencies. He could read and write, and had acquired some general knowledge. On a table near him was a leaf of paper on which were scrawled perhaps two-dozen words. "What is this?" I said. "That," he replied with a laugh, "is my speech."

At Millbury, I also met for the first time, that great leader in reform, William Lloyd Garrison. A friend who introduced me said to him that I was thinking of going to college. Fixing an earnest look upon me, he replied, "The anti-slavery field is the best college for a young man." I accepted this judgment, and acted accordingly, until later I was glad to come to Oberlin to repair as well as I could, the effects of my mistake. Mr. Douglass was permanently guided by Mr. Garrison's opinion on this subject. I cannot find that he ever did such a thing as to attend a school of any kind; and yet wonderful

results were achieved in his life. It would not do, however, for an average young man to follow, as an example, one who had in himself such an imperative law of growth; whose mind seemed to be, in itself, a college with many courses; who saw everything, heard everything, read everything, thought about everything, digested everything, assimilated the good and rejected the bad.

The October following the meeting in Millbury, I engaged regularly in the anti-slavery work, and continued in the service of different societies for two years and four months. To be in the anti-slavery service, in those days, was to be much with Frederick Douglass. I journeyed with him, ate with him, attended meetings with him, and once, as will be seen later, slept with him. At an important crisis, we were both sent to do a work in the State of Rhode Island, my share in which he is pleased to speak of in his "Life" in a manner much beyond its merit. In 1843, the New England Anti-Slavery Society arranged for the holding of one hundred conventions, commencing in New England, extending through New York and Ohio, and as far west as Indianapolis, and returning through Ohio and Pennsylvania to Philadelphia. Six speakers were

detailed to do this work, among whom Mr. Douglass and myself were included. Of course I saw much of him while performing this duty. Later my acquaintance was renewed with him in Oberlin, which he occasionally visited. Later still, I knew him in Washington, where he resided most of the time when I was there. I went to see him in the office of the Recorder of the District of Columbia, over which, for a long time, he presided. I visited at his home in Anacostia, and met him on other occasions. I remember once sitting with him and James G. Blaine in a street car. The conversation between them had been animated. When Mr. Douglass left the car, Mr. Blaine said to me, "That is a remarkable man." It was thus he impressed every thoughtful person who met him.

This extended acquaintance which I had with Mr. Douglass, covering a period of many years, gave me, I trust, an opportunity to form a just estimate of the man.

I cannot, within the limits made necessary by this address, attempt a biography of Frederick Douglass. Nor can I present many anecdotes of his life. It would be easy to fill many pages with these. But I should be glad, if I could take the strong and wholesome impression

which his character—religious, moral, and intellectual—made upon me, and convey it to my hearers. Something of this I shall try to do.

To begin with what must ever be the foundation of all truest manliness, Mr. Douglass, in his religious character, was, and, as I believe, continued to be, throughout his life, a sincere Christian. He had a deeply religious nature, and this, as intelligence advanced, was supported by clear religious convictions and a religious life. It is with a touching simplicity that he gives an account in his "Life" of his conversion, on a Maryland plantation, at the age of thirteen. In his loneliness and destitution, he felt sore need of some one to whom he could go as to a father and protector. He heard a white Methodist preacher say something which made him feel that he could find such a friend in God. He sought God in prayer, and found the friend for whose love and sympathy he so greatly longed. He experienced a great hunger to receive communications from God, and having learned that the Bible was God's word, though not permitted to have one himself, and having acquired, mostly by stealth, some knowledge of reading, he gathered scattered leaves of the Scriptures from the street gutters, "and washed and dried

them that, in moments of leisure," he might receive the divine message from their pages. It was characteristic of the man that, after his conversion and as the proper fruit of that moral change, he promptly devoted himself, in the face of almost insuperable difficulties, and at great personal peril, to efforts for the improvement and elevation of his companions in bondage. He brought together twenty or thirty of his fellow-slaves into a Sunday school, and gave them the best instruction he could. It was necessary, first of all, that they should be taught to read; but they had no books. The teacher himself was taken by surprise to find how soon they provided themselves with these in the form of the spelling-books which had been laid aside by their young masters and mistresses. This school, however, was broken up by the entrance of violent men, one of whom was his white class-leader, into one of its meetings. A second attempt was made under more favorable conditions. About forty scholars attended the school, and a strong attachment, which was never forgotten, was formed between the teacher and his pupils. In addition to the service which he rendered in this Sunday school, he gave instruction to other slaves three evenings in the week. We can appreciate the earnestness

of these men when we remember that all their meetings were unlawful, and attendance upon them, in case of discovery, was likely to be punished with severe flogging, of which the teacher, of course, would receive a double portion. He soon began praying daily to God for deliverance from bondage. This was no mere act of helpless self-abandonment. While praying to another, he was himself constantly watching for opportunities to escape. When he had accomplished this, and found a place of refuge in New Bedford, the Methodists, having discovered his earnest religious character, made him a local preacher of their church. Those who were with Mr. Douglass in his subsequent life, observed how constantly he recognized, in his public addresses, the accountability of men to God, and the obligations imposed upon them by the divine law. To that law, whether found in the Scriptures or written upon the human soul, he constantly appealed; and he habitually acknowledged and quoted the authority of Jesus as the Great Teacher sent of God. Some of our older citizens will remember an impressive scene which occurred in the First Church, many years ago. After a powerful sermon, one Sunday morning, from President Finney, he called upon all those who felt that they had

departed from God, and wished to return and renew their consecration to rise and give expression to this purpose. Frederick Douglass, who happened to be in Oberlin, rose in the midst of the congregation, and said: "I am one of those who have departed from God, and I wish to announce my purpose to return to him, and live a more devoted Christian life." The simple earnestness with which the words were uttered, touched many hearts, and moistened many eyes. I believe that this hearty attachment to the Christian faith continued with him to the end; and as, after death, his body lay in state in the Metropolitan Methodist Church in Washington, I infer that his preference of the Methodist denomination remained with him through life.

I have dwelt the longer upon the religious character of Mr. Douglass for the reason that some persons have taken a different view of it. It has been charged that he attacked the Christian faith. This is a mistake, but not an unnatural one. He entered upon his work in New England, when the prejudice against the anti-slavery people and the colored race was perhaps at its height. Of this prejudice I regret to say that the churches had their share. The idea in most of these was that the colored

people should worship by themselves. As Mr. Douglass was constantly traveling, in a majority of the places which he visited, the people of color were too few or too poor to have a place of worship of their own. When Sunday came, therefore, he must, as a rule, either go to a church of white people, or not go at all. Hence it often happened, as he entered the church door, that he was told "niggers are not admitted here;" or he was taken in by an usher, and quarantined in some corner known as the "nigger pew," and so remote from white people that his color, which seems to have been thought catching, should not break out upon them. If a bold white abolitionist took him into his own pew, it was at the expense of so much irritation and disorder as, to use a phrase of the time, "greatly injured the devotional feeling." Not to generalize further, take a single case. The Rev. Henry Jackson was conducting a revival in New Bedford. It seems to have been successful, and many, doubtless, had been blessed. Presumably Brother Jackson had been preaching, night after night, from such texts as, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters;" "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden;" "And him that cometh unto me I will no wise cast out." Mr.

Douglass wished to share in the blessing, and he seemed to have thought that, if he could attend any religious service with white people, it would be a revival service. Accordingly, he went to the meeting-house, but—to use his own words—"going up the broad aisle for a seat, I was met by a good deacon, who told me, in a pious tone, 'We don't allow niggers in here.'"

Now I am prepared to affirm, from long association with him, that Mr. Douglass met all these slights and insults, not by attacking church organization, but by criticising, with sharp severity I admit, the wrong-doing of individual churches. He was able to make a distinction, which some people are not, between the intrinsic character of Christian institutions and the inconsistent conduct of certain professors. He applied a sounder philosophy to the discussion of religious subjects than did some older anti-slavery leaders. They were noble men and women, and I honored them for their fidelity to conscience. But they subjected their cause to great disadvantage, and lost many sympathizers, by permitting their just indignation against the pro-slavery course of many ministers and church members, to lead them in an attack upon the church and the ministry as such. Mr. Douglass never fell into

this error. I may add here, that his superiority was equally evident in his treatment of government. Prominent anti-slavery men advocated a disruption of the Union with slaveholders ; and some of them repudiated all government founded upon force. They made government, an institution in itself necessary and beneficent, responsible for the oppressions of bad men connected with it. When Mr. Douglass first published a newspaper in Rochester, he, also, took for his motto, "No Union with slaveholders." But he afterwards thought his way out of this, and took the ground that good citizens could perform their duty only by voting for righteousness and liberty, and taking their full share in the responsibilities of government. Here again, as in the case of the church, he was able to distinguish between an institution of the highest value, derived from God himself, and a corrupt administration of it. And thus it happened that there came from the sand hills of Tuckahoe, a parish on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, a self-emancipated slave to set more distinguished reformers an example of the philosophical treatment of government and the church.

I pass to consider another quality of Mr. Douglass, which was, in part, the fruit of his

religious character, and, in part, a native grace. I know not what better name to give it than magnanimity, intending to include under that term a group of attractive traits such as placability, sweetness of temper, fairness, moderation, candor, a readiness to forgive—all of which have, in common, a certain nobleness of mind. What he had to endure for seventy-eight years, first from the cruelties of slavery in the South, and afterwards from the persecutions caused by prejudice in the North, would seem to have made his life a long martyrdom. I have spoken of his reception by the churches. The ill-treatment which he experienced in other quarters, as might be expected, was worse. As a rule, at the hotels and on the lines of travel, whether by railroad, steamboat, omnibus, or stagecoach, and at places of public instruction or entertainment, such as the lecture hall, the opera house, and the concert hall, he was always liable either to prompt exclusion or to such accommodations as exposed him to cold, or filth, or discomfort in some form, and always to insult. From some of these places he was, at times, ejected by violence and even with blows. To such treatment he did not always submit without resistance. When traveling, he experienced some form of ill-usage almost daily.

Now I think you will agree with me in ascribing to Frederick Douglass a magnanimous, placable, and forgiving spirit, when I add that he endured all this without becoming soured. He was always genial, kindly, charitable. I repeat it, and it is worthy to be written in letters of gold: *he never became soured.* The springs of his life seemed to be in the infinite fountains of sweetness and light. He turned all sides of his nature to the sun, and all sides ripened equally mellow and sweet. He had a way of making allowance for and partly excusing his persecutors, which protected him from much bitterness of feeling, and which we should all do well to remember. He said, "Their fault is not so much theirs as it is that of the age. It is the fruit of a corrupt public opinion. Slavery has cast its shadow over the whole land, and we are all its victims in one way or another. It has darkened our understandings, and imposed limitations upon our manhood from which it is difficult to escape. We are all, in a measure, objects of compassion." When intentionally insulted, he generally resented it on the spot, for he had plenty of spirit; but the feeling was gone in a night. He harbored no malice, he retained no grudge.

One incident, in which I was associated with

him, illustrates both these qualities—his quickness to resent and his readiness to forgive. In his "Life," he gives me more credit than I deserved for my share in it, but omits the facts which revealed his own character. I must supply this deficiency. One cold night in December, 1843, Mr. Douglass and I took passage at New York on one of the Sound steamers running from that port to Stonington, Connecticut. Mr. Douglass had the impression, and I suppose I had the same, that, at that time, colored people were allowed, on that line, to have a comfortable bed and a seat at the table. We had gone on board, and while I, perhaps, was looking after our baggage, I happened to observe that he appeared to be having some discussion with the man at the clerk's window. Stepping forward to learn what it was about, I discovered that the clerk had refused him a ticket to the gentlemen's cabin and supper table. Mr. Douglass was saying that formerly on the Sound boats, the steward had provided him with a bed in some retired place, which had offended no one, and he hoped this might be done again. I was about to add my entreaties to those of my friend, when the clerk repeated that no such accommodation could be granted. At this moment, I saw, stepping

rapidly toward us from the right, a stalwart and brutal-looking officer of the boat. As he approached, he called out, "Heigh, you nigger! What are you doing here, disputing with the clerk! Go back to the part of the boat where you belong!" As he said this he put out his hand towards Mr. Douglass, as if he would use some violence upon his person. My friend turned and confronted him with his full height and his leonine head. As he did so he fairly growled in the man's face, "I'll go where you order me, but don't you touch me!" I looked at the man, and as a veracious historian, I affirm that I saw him visibly shrink in size in Mr. Douglass' presence. He had found his master, and he knew it. He muttered something about the great embarrassment they were under in trying to please the public, and withdrew. I knew what would have happened, had he presisted in laying hands on Mr. Douglass. He would have found himself lying flat on his back on the deck. My friend would have knocked him down, and as, at that time, I was not a member of any church, I should have enjoyed the sight. I told the clerk that as my friend could not get a ticket giving him admission to the gentlemen's cabin, I would not buy one myself. There seemed nothing left for us, but to

walk the deck, in the sharp cold, without supper, without bed, and without fire. We had done this for some time, warming ourselves as well as we could by exercise, when I made a discovery. In one part of the boat I found a huge pile of cotton bales heaped up between the deck upon which we were walking, and what I believe was called the hurricane deck, over our heads. In the upper part of this space I discovered some warmth which might have escaped from the machinery. I also observed that above the cotton bales there was a vacant space of perhaps two feet in height. Pointing to it, I said to Mr. Douglass, "It seems to be warm up there. Why can't we climb up, and get a night's rest?" He thought we could. We accordingly climbed up, crept into the warm space, stretched ourselves out, put our bags under our heads and had a good night's sleep. The next morning we were in Stonington, and took the train for Providence. As we rushed along through the busy Rhode Island villages, I still felt disturbed and irritated over the treatment we had received the night before. But not a trace of it was left in the mind of my friend. He was cheerful, genial, hopeful, and happy.

Another noticeable quality in Mr. Douglass

was his loyalty to all honest relations. He was a loyal son, a loyal brother, a loyal husband, a loyal father, a loyal friend, and a loyal neighbor. He was loyal to his country and loyal to his religion. For all natural relations,—relations established by the Creator,—he had a sincere respect. It would be interesting to dwell upon his character in several of these, did my space permit.

In speaking of the qualities of Mr. Douglass thus far—his religious character, his magnanimity and readiness to forgive, and his loyalty to all honest relations—I have dwelt only upon his moral traits; and I may add, before leaving this part of my subject, that, running through all the qualities I have named, was one characteristic element which endeared him to all who knew him. He had a large capacity for doing things which he did not like to do, because he ought to do them. He laid hold of disagreeable or dangerous work with an appetite, when it was decided that he was the best man for it. His self-abnegation of character was exhibited for several years in one form which gave much anxiety to his friends. In 1841 he began giving public addresses in New England on the subject of slavery, and this he continued for four years, or until he visited England. He had

adopted the imperfect disguise of changing his slave name of Frederick Bailey to that of Frederick Douglass; but as, in his lectures, he often gave facts and experiences of his life in bondage, it was evident that he was liable any day to have his identity discovered, to be arrested by a writ issued from some United States Court under the Fugitive Slave Law of 1793, and, after a hurried examination, to be returned to slavery, where terrible punishments would have awaited him for the double crime of escaping from his prison-house and the public exposure of its dark secrets. For four years he could have undertaken no journey, nor been in any place where not surrounded by his friends, without constant danger of arrest. It must have been a most anxious and wearing experience, or, at least, would have been, to any man of less sunny and hopeful temper. Now he might have been spared all this by permitting his friends to buy him of his old master; and there were many abolitionists who were ready to join in furnishing the money for the purpose. But friends whom he reverenced had early convinced Mr. Douglass that such an act of purchase would be a recognition of the slaveholder's right of property in man, which would be morally wrong. Hence Mr. Douglass steadily refused to permit

his freedom to be acquired by purchase, and bravely subjected himself for four years to all the hazards of his exposed position. It appears to me that there have been few nobler examples of self-denial for conscience' sake, in the history of the Christian church. When he visited England, the Quaker Abolitionists of that country, without his participation, contributed a sufficient amount for the purpose, purchased his freedom through a Philadelphia lawyer, and before he returned to the United States presented him with his free papers. He was thus enabled to engage once more in work in his native country with one great burden removed.

If a young man were to ask me, what is the most effective single element in the production of a great life, I should answer, that ability which Frederick Douglass possessed in so marked a degree, to subordinate inclination to duty. He who is ready to do disagreeable work because the common interest requires it, has conquered his place. It is a noble and rare gift. It is the mother of industry. It is the mother of scholarship. It is the mother of inventions. It is the mother of eloquence. It is the mother of noble living. He who has acquired it, has already risen to a higher plane,

and walks among the angels. By what discipline of life can it best be obtained? Every father would shrink with horror from the thought of offering his son, as the means of such discipline, twenty-one years of slavery, which is what Douglass had, instead of the same number of years in school, college, and university. And yet, which of the two would be the most effective would depend upon the man himself. A man may come forth from twenty-one years of slavery eager for knowledge, candid, brave, magnanimous, energetic, determined to know God's truth and to teach it. A man may come forth from twenty-one years of scholastic training, self-indulgent, effeminate, afraid to grapple with hard work, and feeling that if obedience to divine law is expected from him, then obedience must be made easy and attractive. Some men appear to think that in this universe of thought and of work, they are wronged, if they are not amused. I seem to see going forth upon the march of life two armies —one upon whose banner is inscribed "Work! Service!" another with a banner on which is written "Amusement! Self-indulgence!" Each man must decide for himself with which army he can be most worthily enrolled.

In considering next the intellectual powers

of Mr. Douglass, I must confine myself to one of these—his eloquence of speech. He had noticeable ability as a writer, and the record which he made for himself as a journalist and an author would have attracted wide and favorable attention but for his larger gifts as an orator. He was one of the best platform speakers of his time. Many qualities contributed to this. He had wide and accurate information, skill and strength in debate, ability in clear and picturesque narrative, and great power of statement. The last was a remarkable gift, and I am sorry that I cannot enlarge upon it. But he had two gifts which were characteristic—were specially his own, existing in him as they did in no one else; and upon these only can I dwell in this address. These qualities were, first, what, for the want of a better word, I may call *fervor*, and, second, *humor*. His fervor was a product of his character—his earnestness, especially upon every subject connected with human liberty. It had in it a certain masterful force, which awed and subdued the hearers. But, mingled with this, there was a tone of pathetic appeal, which won and conciliated. His fervor was made up of energy and pathos with a flavor of Frederick Douglass, and was something wholly unique. In his serious speeches,

this fervor, in the first sentence, fixed attention, which never slackened to the end. Simple, unconscious, glowing, it was equally acceptable to all. The aged and the young, the educated and the illiterate, friends and opponents—all felt drawn into communion with the speaker, and there they were held. The mixed character of the audience never seemed to diminish the aggregate of interest. Many of his hearers, as was true of hearers of Wendell Phillips, who were plain and uncultivated men, and had not been thought by their friends capable of the highest moral feeling, went away delighted with his eloquence, because, by it, new experiences and new enthusiasms were opened up in their souls. It was a glad discovery to them that they possessed inspirations, aspirations after great endeavor, high moral purposes of which they had not suspected themselves of being capable. His fervor called to life the dormant germs of whatever is best in men ; and enlarged self-respect and a higher order of living were among its fruits.

His humor, like his fervor, was also a rare gift. In his milder moods, it was wholly enjoyable. I know not from what deep fountain of graces in his nature it bubbled up. He gave himself wholly to it; and as you listened,

you felt the whole of mind and body suffused with a genial sense of fun which warmed the heart and tickled all the nerves. His humor reminds me of the gentle lightnings which one sees on a remote summer cloud. It was playful, lambent, innocuous, luminous, picturesque. But, even in this form, it was educational. Without expecting it and when perfectly off your guard, you had been taught a lesson. On counting your cherished prejudices, you found there was one the less. And it would not always do to trust to the harmlessness of his humor. Behind this charming light stood its twin brother, heat. Near the boundary of his fervor they sometimes united, and then they not only illuminated but they scorched.

Many passages in the speeches of Mr. Douglass made a very strong impression upon my mind. I should be glad if I could reproduce them. But in most cases this would be impossible, only an admiring impression remaining in memory. But there are two or three which I might do something towards setting before you. The first of these is a serious passage, and relates to a historical incident which produced some excitement at the time. In the autumn of 1841, the brig Creole, with the customary officers and crew, and with 135 slaves on

board, in charge of a slave-trader named Howell, sailed from the port of Richmond for New Orleans and a market. When they reached the neighborhood of the Bahama Islands, the slaves rose, took possession of the brig and steered her into the port of Nassau, where the British authorities set them at liberty. It was, perhaps, some time before this, that a Southern statesman had published a speech or pamphlet in which he had endeavored to prove that of all political communities, those which are based upon slavery as a foundation are the most secure, and the best protected against disorder. Mr. Douglass was making a speech in which he was refuting this proposition. He was fond of introducing current events into his public efforts, and, on this occasion, he made the case of the Creole a part of his argument. I can give you the substance of his thought and some of his language. The rest must be my own. Brilliant phrases and felicitous turns of expression will be his; mine will be the prosy passages which connect them. He said, in substance:—

"The Creole had gained the high seas, and was entering those Southern latitudes which quiet waters and perpetual summer make enchanting. The day was warm, and most of the officers and crew and the slave-trader were

taking their noontide siesta. They felt secure, and why should they not so feel? Did not their ship's community rest upon slavery, the safest of all foundations? There was a man at the wheel, and one or two sailors lounging about the deck. Nothing more was needed. In the hold below, one hundred and thirty-five slaves with manacled wrists, were sweltering and suffocating, in the narrow space, from heat and foul air. Their faces all wore that stolid and hopeless look common to men who are simply trying to endure existence. Did I say all? There was one exception. There was one restless brain—one restless eye and animated face. Madison Washington, who bore the name of the Father of his Country and that of one of its greatest statesmen, and who, on this day, acted worthily of both, sat planning in the sultry air. He resolved that he would go on deck and learn the situation. Strong and resolute, he struggled with his chains until he broke them. He passed swiftly up the hatchway, and looked about him. No one saw him. Around him, on every hand, spread out as far as the eye could see, and reposing in beauty, was the mighty ocean. Above was the infinite sky, stretching away and away and away, until, on the distant horizon, it bent

down to kiss the sleeping sea. As he looked upon this glorified scene, the great thought came to him that the God who made the sky and the sea, as well as the solid land, had made him and his comrades free. To think was to act. He ran below. In a few moments he had helped nineteen stalwart men to break their chains. 'Follow me,' he said to them, 'and do as I tell you, and I will make you free.' They rushed on deck. The first few white men they met they bound with cords. But there was an outcry, and soon a fierce struggle. The slaves conquered, and took control of the ship. Several white men were wounded; only one was killed. He, by an accident which we can but approve, was the slave-dealer. Washington spared his white enemies as far as was possible, consistently with the securing of liberty for himself and his friends. 'It was not our purpose,' he afterward testified, 'to kill any one. We only wished to obtain our freedom. The killing of a man was an unfortunate incident of the contest.' The mutineers now had control of the ship; but what should they do with her? They knew nothing of navigation; but Madison Washington had some knowledge of reading and writing, and he had observed the movements of the sun and of the stars in their courses. He

knew that if the brig was to go to the port of New Orleans, she must soon turn her bow to the west; and he also knew that if she should make a course somewhat east of south, she would soon reach that desirable region, the British West Indies. He kept two stalwart black men stationed, night and day, one on each side of the man at the wheel, and that officer was made to understand that any act of treachery on his part would be followed by instant death. He chose not to die, and in forty-eight hours they had entered the harbor of Nassau, in the Bahama Islands, and saw the British flag floating over the forts. The English authorities came on board, investigated the case, and decided that the mutineers could not be returned to the United States. They were all set free, and although the long arm of Daniel Webster was stretched across the Atlantic to reclaim them, there came back nothing in his hand except the answer, 'There is no writ, no process, known to British law, under which these men can be arrested.' And thus was added another to the list of humiliating failures of social organizations founded upon the boasted security of chattel slavery."

The serious defect in this attempt to reproduce a representative passage from Mr.

Douglass' speeches, is that I cannot give his great manner—his noble fervor.

But if thus imperfect has been my success in trying to give an example of his serious discourse, still greater must be my difficulties in endeavoring to bring out any humorous passages from his speeches. His humor was a subtle, volatile, delightful fragrance. But it is gone, and no one can reproduce it for us. When his audiences discovered that he was about to indulge in a humorous treatment of his subject, they, as a rule, settled themselves for a time of quiet enjoyment. But there was one passage in some of his discourses, which was often called for and often delivered, and which, I think, produced more convulsive laughter in large popular audiences than any passage of similar length delivered by any other American orator. It was an account of a sermon which used to be preached at the request of the master, by some judiciously selected minister of a sensational and subservient order, to the slaves upon the plantation, to make them contented with their condition. If the sermon was satisfactory, the preacher received handsome presents from the planter. I heard this sermon more than once, and would give much if I had a verbatim report of it. Some of the principal

points—the dry bones—I can easily give you, though mostly in my own language; but the flesh and blood are irrecoverably gone. As presented by Mr. Douglass, no doubt with substantial accuracy, it was a brilliant example of irony, parody, caricature, and *reductio ad absurdum*, all combined. It abounded in phrases which, though innocent in the original preacher, when delivered by Mr. Douglass with suggestive tone and emphasis to a Northern audience, became irresistibly ludicrous. Most of these have escaped my memory. The text always was, "Servants, obey your masters." It was not thought important that precisely these words are nowhere found in the New Testament, because so much of the New Testament is assumed to be expressed in them. The preacher explained his text and presented his points to his audience of slaves somewhat after this fashion:—

"The word 'servants' means slaves such as you, as it always does in the Bible. The word 'masters' means owners of slaves such as your masters. The text, then, contains a command of God addressed directly to you to obey your masters. This ought to be enough to secure your obedience without another word; for God is not only your master, but the Master of your

masters. We are all, masters and slaves, his servants, for we are all bought with a price. God's command, therefore, as I said, ought to be enough. But as your minds are weak, and need much explanation, I will give you several particular reasons why you should obey this command.

"*First.* You should do it from gratitude. It is due to the system of slavery that your ancestors were brought from a land of heathenish darkness, and placed in this country, where they and their posterity could enjoy gospel privileges—could have the hope of heaven instead of the prospect of an awful hell. Now your masters, under the providence of God, have the management of this system of slavery, and hence you should obey them. It is the least return which you can make for your great blessings.

"*Second.* Your masters can take care of you, and you cannot take care of yourselves. You are to them what the hands and feet are to the head. They can think and plan and provide, and you cannot. Remember what a mercy it is for you to have food and clothing and shelter and support in old age, and rest on the Sabbath, and gospel privileges, all provided for you without any care on your part. What would become

of you, if you had no such protectors and care-takers? To understand what your situation, in that case, would be, you have only to consider the miserable condition of those among you who call themselves free negroes, and whom we have sometimes found at the door of your humble cottages begging for a piece of bread. Still more awful is the condition of those misguided negroes who have escaped to the North, and of whose wretched condition we have such sad accounts.

"*Third.* You should obey your masters because it is in accord with the great plan of God. The Creator, in the councils of infinite wisdom, had decided that it was best for the human race that they should be divided into two great portions, slaves and the masters of slaves. But there was much danger that the world would be filled with constant strife, and even war and bloodshed, in the attempt to decide to which of these classes different tribes or different men should belong. To save all this strife, and to put the question forever at rest, God determined to put distinctive and unmistakable marks upon these two classes—to make all the men and women designed to be slaves black, and all the men and women designed to be masters white. By this simple and beautiful device, each man

is enabled to know at once to what class he belongs. What a merciful provision this plan of God is, and how reasonable it is that you should show your acceptance of it by obeying your masters.

"*Fourth.* You should obey your masters because you will thus promote the world's commerce, and through it the world's civilization. Nothing is more necessary to trade among the nations than the four great staples, tobacco, rice, cotton, and sugar. But these can be produced only in those climates where the white races cannot engage in severe physical labor. God has so ordained that your masters can manage plantations, can organize labor, and can superintend the production of these staples; but they have not the physical qualities to go into the field with the hoe and the plow. You see how they have to avoid exposure to the sun. If your mistress happens to step for a moment from the porch of the great house into the open sunshine, she is compelled at once to shade her face and head with some covering. How soon her complexion is spoiled by exposure to the sun. But, my black hearers, your complexions cannot be spoiled. You are children of the sun. You rejoice to have his rays beat upon your heads. You gladly sleep in

his noonday heats. To work hard in the sun of a hot climate is just what you are fitted for, as were your ancestors in Africa before you. You should rejoice, then, in the grand share which is given you in the world's work, and obey your masters."

I am painfully aware how poor a representative of Mr. Douglass' effort this passage is. To do him justice you must substitute for my stiff and formal language the racy and dramatic words of the plantation preacher as Mr. Douglass gave them to us. You must imagine a hundred humorous phrases and incidental allusions which I can no longer recall. More than all, you must imagine his marvelous power of imitation and characterization—the holy tone of the preacher—the pious snuffle—the upturned eye—the funny affectation of profound wisdom—the long-drawn, almost sepulchral notes in which the monitory portions were rendered—the attempt to grow gallant and mincing and tender when the delicate complexion of the lady of the great house, and the certainty that it must suffer if exposed to the sun, were spoken of—and the tearful sympathy with which the speaker dwelt upon the helpless condition of his hearers in case they should cease to be the property of slave-holding masters.

All this Mr. Douglass reproduced in a manner worthy of Garrick.

Mr. Douglass was a mulatto, and it has been common to speak of his oratorical powers as due to his white blood. I knew of an Irishman who took the opposite view. Mr. Douglass was speaking with great effect in a town in Ohio, on the Ohio River. In the rear of the audience stood our Irishman, and near him a Kentuckian who had come across the river to hear the now famous fugitive slave. Some persons in their vicinity were remarking upon the eloquence of the speaker. "But don't you see," said the Kentuckian, "he is half white." The Irishman responded, "An' sure, if half a naygur can spake like that, what would a houl one do?" Frederick Douglass himself gave large credit for the gifts which he possessed to his mother. She appears to have been a remarkable woman. He states that she was the only colored person in Tuckahoe parish who had learned to read. Only a strong native desire for knowledge could have enabled her to achieve this accomplishment in face of the difficulties which had to be overcome. He says, "She was tall and finely proportioned, of dark, glossy complexion, with regular features, and amongst the slaves was remarkably sedate and dignified." She died while

he was still young, and of this he remarks, "To me it has ever been a grief that I knew my mother so little, and have so few of her words treasured in my remembrance."

Such, though very imperfectly presented, were some of the qualities of Frederick Douglass. They were the weapons of his warfare. It was with the aid of these that he did his noble life work. I have thought that with the exception of two names, those of Garrison and Phillips, he did as much as any man of his generation to form that advanced public opinion which sustained the North in the war for the Union, and enabled President Lincoln to issue his Proclamation of Emancipation. His audiences were generally large, and, as a rule, they gave him attentive and candid hearing. This was due not only to his great powers, but to his reputation for fairness. His genial, kindly spirit opened all ears and all hearts to his appeals. If such a distinction is permissible, it might be said that though there was much prejudice against his color, there was little or none against him. They could say with Desdemona, "I saw Othello's visage in his mind." As a favorite with popular assemblies, he ranked with Wendell Phillips. The favorable impression which he made was still farther

strengthened by his absolutely unique history. In all time there is scarcely another example of so noble a life from so humble a beginning. People wished to hear the man who had won victory in the battle at such fearful odds—the chattel slave who had become one of Boston's favorite orators. They said, "Let us greet this speaker

> 'Who breaks his birth's invidious bar
> And grasps the skirt of happy chance,
> And breasts the blows of circumstance
> And grapples with his evil star.'"

To these causes it was owing that he constantly made converts, and strengthened the anti-slavery feeling of the country. It was thus that he did a mighty work in educating the nation for that fearful struggle in which it was soon to engage.

It was not more to the honor of Frederick Douglass than to that of the whole nation, that the government repeatedly recognized his great merit by bestowing upon him responsible official trusts. Some of these I may mention. President Grant made him a member, in company with other distinguished men, of the Commission to Santo Domingo. President Hayes appointed him Marshal of the District of Columbia, an office with many delicate duties.

President Garfield gave him the lucrative place of Recorder of the District of Columbia. President Harrison appointed him Minister Resident to Hayti. I might add that in 1872 he was nominated as Presidential elector-at-large by the Republican party of the State of New York, and after the election was chosen to carry the electoral vote of that State to the National Capitol. These decorations were the more honorable because they were unsought. Mr. Douglass was never an office-seeker. When a member of the government wished to give him an appointment, he "sent for him," as the Queen of England is said to "send" for the man whom she wishes to make her premier. It was thus reserved for this fugitive slave to offer to our public men an example of dignified self-respect in the receiving of high office. His recognition by the people at large was as cordial as that by the government. His income from the sale of his books and from constant employment as a lecturer, enabled him to accumulate a handsome estate.

It has been said that Frederick Douglass was an example to his race; it would be more just to say that he was an example to all races. When Marshal Turenne, the great field officer of Louis XIV., was killed in a battle between

the French army and that of the Empire, the commander of the imperial forces, instead of receiving the news of the death of his great adversary with expressions of satisfaction, as those about him expected, halted his column, and with uncovered head said to his suite, "To-day a soldier has fallen who did honor to man." So prejudice itself, standing uncovered by the grave of Frederick Douglass, might say, "Here rests one who did honor to mankind."

MY FIRST LEGISLATIVE EXPERIENCE.

I.

WORK IN THE LEGISLATURE.

A THURSDAY LECTURE.

I HAD chosen as my subject for this occasion, "The First Republican General Assembly of the State of Ohio." That General Assembly, of which I happened to be a member, covered the period from the first Monday in January, 1856, to the first Monday in January, 1858. Its members were elected in October, 1855—thirty-three years ago last October*—a length of time corresponding to what we call a generation. It was thought you might be interested to hear from a participant in the Republican work of that time, some account of what Republicans were doing when they were first coming into power in the different States, before any of the students who now hear me were

* This lecture was delivered in 1888.

born—some account of their aims, their methods, their spirit, their theory of government, their subjects of legislation—some account of how the young Republicans of that day appeared, and how they did their work. But as I was getting my pen sharpened to deal with this subject, I encountered a difficulty. I naturally found that I remembered much better, or had much better means of recalling, what I had done myself in the Legislature of 1856, with the motives for it and the means employed, than what was done by others. The danger, therefore, was, if I went on with the title I had chosen, that it would appear to you that under the guise of describing a General Assembly, I had given an account of myself. Hence I decided that whatever of egotism there might be in this lecture, should be openly avowed, and that my subject should be announced as "My First Legislative Experience." With this statement of my theme, I hope that I shall still be able to give you a sample of what the work of young Republicans was a third of a century ago, and I shall not be prevented from speaking of the work of others than myself so far as I can do so intelligently. But it is not easy to give a clear account of the action of the members of a State Legislature which met thirty-three years since.

There is no official report of their speeches and the explanations of their votes, and the reports of the newspapers of the time are either no longer accessible, or are too imperfect or unfair to be satisfactory. I have recently thought that the "Congressional Record," which contains complete reports of all speeches of members of Congress, and, of course, much nonsense, is worth all that it costs as a help to historical research.

The fresh series of outrages upon liberty which began with the "Compromise Measures of 1850," including the Fugitive Slave Law and its harsh execution during the years that followed its enactment; and which closed with the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, the repeal of the "Missouri Compromise," of 1820, and the opening of all our free territory to the ravages of slavery, had at length enabled the dullest Northern men to see that the country could not continue to exist half slave and half free—that slavery and freedom were, as they always must be, engaged in mortal conflict, and that one or the other must perish. It was for the people to say which was the better worth saving. A political revolution broke out in 1854, which carried the day in most of the Northern States. The most common designation

for the new party was "Anti-Nebraska," although in some States it was already known as Republican. In 1855, a Republican organization was completed in nearly all the free States where this had not been done in 1854. One of these was Ohio. Our State had gone Anti-Nebraska and had elected an unbroken Anti-Nebraska delegation to Congress in 1854. This work had not been distinctively Republican. But in 1855, a convention of men opposed to slavery extension, met at Columbus, took the name of Republican, and gave the people an earnest of their serious purpose by the nomination of Salmon P. Chase for Governor. Ohio was now in harmony with the new movement. But there must be a Republican Legislature as well as a Republican Governor. Ohio had never had either as yet; but it was necessary she should have both, if she would protect her people against the aggressions of the slave-holding oligarchy. The papers were soon engaged in discussing the merits of candidates for the House and Senate.

In Lorain County it was often said that Oberlin should have the candidate for the House of Representatives. The unpopularity and even persecution which Oberlin had encountered at an earlier day by faithful adherence to a hated

but righteous cause, were thought to furnish a good reason for bestowing upon her this mark of approval. Professor Henry E. Peck and myself had both been mentioned for the position. He was an alumnus of our Theological Department, had been a successful minister of the Gospel in Rochester, New York, and had afterwards been called to the Chair of Sacred Rhetoric in this Institution. When talked with about accepting a nomination, he, good man that he was, did what I hope you will all do in cases of doubt affecting the interests of the College—he consulted the Faculty. It so happened that I was not present at the meeting when the subject was considered, but I learned afterwards that the Faculty advised him not to permit the use of his name, partly because he was so widely known as a clergyman, which they thought an objection to his going into politics, and partly because they doubted whether it was good policy for professors in the College to be candidates for office. In the meantime I had so far committed myself as to say to some Republicans that had talked with me that I would take the nomination should the people think it best to give it. As the public service required of a Representative would be rendered in the winter, which was then the time of our

long vacation, I had assumed that the Faculty would not object to my accepting the position. My nomination by a nearly unanimous vote followed soon afterwards, at a mass meeting held in Elyria, and the canvass resulted in my election by a large majority in October. Professor Peck was active in promoting both the nomination and the election. I was never brought before the Faculty for the decision I had made, and I was afterwards indebted to several of them for sympathy and assistance in carrying on my legislative work.

I cannot pass on without adding a word to what I have said of Professor Peck. He has always appeared to me to be one of the brightest and most estimable men that Oberlin has produced. In his intellectual efforts he was clear, clean-cut, instructive, magnetic, witty, incisive, logical, and analogical. Morally he was, in a truer sense than the elder Mirabeau, a "Friend of Man," sympathetic, helpful, watchful for the good of others, incited to action by a heart of love. He finally entered the public service as minister to Hayti, where he did admirable work both for his own country and for the people to whom he was accredited. The dispatches which he sent to his government from Port au Prince, are so statesmanlike, so

sagacious, convey so much knowledge, and give so clear a view of the situation, that they take rank among the best papers in our diplomatic literature. He died at his post while engaged in this faithful and disinterested service, and I afterwards had the melancholy satisfaction of successfully petitioning that excellent minister of State, Secretary Fish, to pay out of his contingent fund the amount necessary to remove the remains of my colleague from their far-off grave in the tropics to the Oberlin cemetery, where they now lie interred. His wasted frame added one more to the treasures of that hallowed ground.

In October, 1855, it was still a new thing for an old abolitionist to be elected to office, and it was certainly a new thing to me. A shower of friendly votes was a pleasanter experience than a shower of brickbats. The announcement that the Republican candidate in Lorain had carried the county by an overwhelming majority, no doubt made pleasant reading in the papers, and it is not improbable that to the member-elect the cause of liberty wore a more hopeful aspect than it had done before. But this holiday feeling became more serious, when he learned, in conversation and from correspondence, how much he was expected

to accomplish in the way of important legislation in the coming General Assembly. The first subject which claimed attention, and one in which there was general interest, was the relations of the State to the new Fugitive Slave Law. Under the provisions of that law, the personal liberty of two classes of free and unoffending citizens was exposed to special danger. The first of these consisted of persons alleged to be fugitives, and to the second belonged their anti-slavery friends who tried to protect them. It was not uncommon in those days to hear that men known to have been free all their lives had been sent into slavery.

Mr. Horace Mann told us in a speech in Congress that "of the first eight persons doomed to life-long bondage under the Law, four were free men." Again, all through the North, citizens of the highest respectability were arrested and thrown into prison, on a mere suspicion of having aided a fugitive to escape his pursuer.

The great and sufficient protection of our citizens against these atrocities should have been found in the writ of Habeas Corpus. In all these cases, our State courts and judges should have had the power to bring before them, under the great writ of right, the person restrained of his liberty, to investigate the case

dispassionately and thoroughly, and to set the prisoner at liberty when unlawfully held. From the time of Charles the Second down to the present day, the very soul, the vital principle of the writ of Habeas Corpus, that which has made it what it is, has been that under it you could *have the body* of the arrested man before the court issuing the writ. Without the custody of the prisoner, the power of the court is a nullity and the issuing of the writ a farce. But it was one of the bitter fruits of that servility which slavery had produced in the North, that our State courts in their relations to Federal officers had surrendered all the control which the writ of Habeas Corpus gives over the body of the man alleged to be unlawfully deprived of liberty. Here the writ was virtually abolished. The liberties and the homes of American citizens were left defenseless to an extent that in England would not have been endured for an hour. If the self-respect of the judge ever permitted him to address the writ to a man claiming to be a United States officer, that official took no further notice of it than to make return that he held the prisoner under a writ from a United States court, which court was commonly only a Commissioner under the Fugitive Slave Law. The return itself might

be a falsehood, but the State judge, as a rule, did not attempt to proceed any further. Like other States, Ohio had, at that time, a Habeas Corpus Act, which was passed in 1811, and which required that the body of the prisoner should be produced; and the writ issued under it commanded that this should be done. But this command was systematically disobeyed. I suppose it was claimed that the return of the Federal officer that he held the prisoner by a writ from a United States court, was a constructive production of the body.

The defenses of liberty being thus broken down or abandoned, several Northern States, previous to 1855, had passed what were known as "Personal Liberty Bills" for the protection of their citizens. These bills assumed various forms according to the state of public opinion and the necessities of the case in different communities. Now that a Republican Legislature and Governor had been elected in Ohio, it was felt, especially on the Reserve, that this State also must enact some law which would be a safeguard of the liberties of its people. This subject was the one which had been principally discussed during the campaign, and the interest in it was increased by the result of the election. It was said that upon me as an old anti-slavery

lecturer and a representative of Oberlin, would devolve the responsibility of introducing and carrying through a personal liberty bill. This was the work which, above everything else, I desired to do, but, for reasons which will appear, it looked like a formidable undertaking.

The next subject of legislation urged upon my attention, like the one already named, made a strong appeal to humane feeling. The State of Ohio had made no provision for the discipline, education, and reform of its juvenile offenders. It had never established a reform school. When a young man, engaged in anti-slavery work in New England, I had become aware of the existence of a few institutions of this kind, and had known something of their objects, methods, and results. I had felt greatly interested in these schools, and the interest had continued with me, though I had no thought of ever having a share in the establishment of one of them. But after my election, the merely vague and general interest which I had felt in this subject was quickened into something definite by a letter which I received from Mr. L. L. Rice, a gentleman well known to us here, who died a few years since in Honolulu.

Mr. Rice had been editor of a newspaper in Painesville, and was soon to be appointed

private secretary of Governor Chase. He was one of the early abolitionists, and had a warm heart for everything that concerned human well-being. He wrote me calling attention to the neglected juvenile offenders of the State, and described their claims to sympathy and help. He denounced the policy which had busied itself about many indifferent matters and had left these hundreds of little ones to perish. It was a shame to Ohio that she had not given earlier attention to their needs. But now it appeared that this good cause also had found its opportunity. There was a majority of Republicans in the Legislature, and *Oberlin* had a representative among them. Both as a teacher and as an anti-slavery philanthropist, he was presumably interested in these often hungry and homeless orphans of the State. He must espouse the cause of this perishing class, and see to it that the Legislature did not adjourn until some law had been passed for their rescue and reform. You will see that I could do nothing less than to add "Reform Schools" to my list of causes demanding legislation. I commenced corresponding and making inquiries, and soon accumulated quite a mass of reports, catalogues, and other literature upon the subject.

A third cause which a representative of

Oberlin was supposed to be under special obligation to champion, was the new common school system of the State. The legislation of Ohio in regard to its public schools had been somewhat ill digested and unsystematic until the year 1853. During that year a carefully considered and comprehensive law of which Mr. Harvey Rice, a leading Democrat of Cleveland, was the author, was passed, much to its credit, by a Democratic legislature. This law was a great improvement upon the past, was regarded with satisfaction by teachers and the friends of education, and with some amendments has remained the school law of the State until this day. When the Republicans came into power, they exhibited some hostility to this law, and proposed to amend it to such an extent as would impair its efficiency. This was owing, in a measure, perhaps, to party feeling. The school law had been passed by the pro-slavery Democracy, and was likely for that reason alone to be wrong. But the opposition to it was due still more to the feeling in favor of retrenchment. The school system cost too much, and the large power of taxation granted in it must be severely limited. The Democratic minority in the new legislature were generally disposed to stand by the law,

and it was deemed important that some Republican should take an active part in effecting a union between them and such Republicans as were sufficiently devoted to the cause of education to be willing to separate from their party friends in their votes upon this question. But what Republican could so reasonably be expected to do this as a man from a college town who was himself a teacher? Hence I was told that I must watch over this interest also and see that it received no detriment.

There was one more cause which it was supposed that none but an Oberlin man could, or at least would, undertake to defend. That paragraph in the constitution of the State which bestowed and defined the right of suffrage, contained the limiting word "white." Now if there was anything which might be said to enrage the early abolitionists of Ohio, it was this word "white" in their organic law. They talked of its "meanness," its "littleness," its "narrowness," its "unscripturalness," its "unphilosophicalness," and its every other kind of "ness" whether in the dictionary or out of it. How could I ever look my constituents in the face again, if I came home leaving that word in the constitution? The removal of this limitation upon the privilege of the

elective franchise, was no doubt most desirable. But all that could legally be accomplished through the Legislature was the submission to the people of an amendment to the constitution, securing this object. How impracticable even this was, became apparent when it was ascertained that every Democrat and more that half of the Republicans were opposed to it. But I promised to make an effort.

Thus there were four principal things which I was expected to accomplish—the passage of a personal liberty bill, the establishment of a reform school, the protection of the common school system, and such preliminary legislation as was necessary in order to strike the word "white" from the constitution.

This would seem to have been work enough for an inexperienced man, but it must not be supposed that this was all which I was asked to do. I received several suggestions as to legislation from the lawyers of my county. I do not very well remember what these were for this session, but they would cover such points as a bill to enlarge the legal definition of burglary so as to include the violent breaking into a smokehouse in the night-time to steal hams; a bill to regulate the selection of talesmen for juries by sheriffs of counties; a bill to increase

the mileage and per diem of county commissioners. The farmers also had suggestions for their member-elect. These related to such subjects as laws to protect sheep against dogs; to compel railway companies to fence their tracks; to prevent cattle and swine from running at large; and to reduce the salaries of members of the General Assembly. You will see that it was high time this should be done when I tell you that under the corrupt rule of our Democratic predecessors the pay of members had gone up to the enormous sum of four dollars per day, not more than half of which was charged at the hotels for their board. A general interest was expressed this year—and expressed, doubtless, to myself as well as others—to have something done for the protection of birds, except, as the phrase ran, "crows, blackbirds, and birds of prey." The doctors wished us to pass a law for the promotion of anatomical science. This was to be accomplished, I believe, by handing over to the medical colleges the bodies of certain criminal and pauper classes—not, of course, until after they were dead.

Thus equipped with suggestions, exhortation, and warning, I set out for Columbus some days before the opening of the session, as you

will no doubt think it was wise that I should do. In due time the two Houses were organized. Mr. VanVorhes of Athens County was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, which proved to be an excellent choice. He gave the old Free-soilers from the Western Reserve their fair share of good positions upon committees. I was placed upon three standing committees—those on Common Schools, the Penitentiary, and the Revision of Bills. Of the Committee on Common Schools, I was made the chairman. I was also appointed from time to time upon select committees.

In entering upon my work in the House, attention was first given to the preparation of some form of law which would protect the liberty of the people against the Fugitive Slave Act. But it seemed necessary before taking any decisive step to become acquainted with my fellow-members and see what help I could hope for from them. About one half of the Republicans were very conservative, and much inclined to vote with the Democrats upon any question which looked like one of Abolitionism. They had nothing that could be called anti-slavery *principle* as that term was understood in Oberlin. They were indignant at the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. They thought

slavery should be prohibited in the territories north of 36° 30′, and they would have been glad if it could have been prohibited in all the territories; but this they thought more than we had any right to expect. As to a personal liberty bill they didn't know, but were fearful. What was it like? Wasn't it Abolitionism? How would it sound on the Ohio River? Wouldn't it hurt the feelings of our Southern brethren? Wouldn't it divide our party? Wouldn't it endanger the Union? How did I know but what Garrison would approve of it? I reasoned with these brethren, comforted them as well as I could, and in hope of carrying them with me allowed several weeks to elapse before introducing the bill. In this delay, I had, as I understood it, the full approval of Governor Chase, with whom I conferred freely upon the subject. He told me that, when the bill should come before the House, he would talk with members in favor of its passage so far as he could do so without exposing himself to the charge of trying unduly to influence a coordinate branch of the Government.

Matters were in this shape when there occurred in the city of Cincinnati what was perhaps the most startling and certainly the most pathetic tragedy in the history of the anti-

slavery movement. On Sunday night, the 27th of January, 1856, Margaret Garner and her husband, Robert, with their four young children, all slaves of a man named Gaines, living in Boone County, Kentucky, escaped from the plantation of their master, reached the Ohio River early Monday morning, crossed it on the ice, and found shelter in the house of a colored man in Cincinnati. Gaines pursued them, and, finding where they were hidden, obtained a warrant from a United States Commissioner, and, accompanied by a deputy marshal and his assistants, went to the colored man's house on his hateful errand. The fugitives had barricaded their place of refuge as well as the means at their command would permit; but, though they fought bravely, they were soon overpowered. The window and door were broken in, the assailants entered, and the slaves were at their mercy. When Margaret saw that she and Robert could make no further resistance, she promptly decided to destroy herself and her children rather than be returned to slavery. Seizing a knife, she killed a beautiful daughter —the child that she loved best, and the one which perhaps unhappy experience had taught her most needed to be rescued from slavery— and was proceeding on her sad and terrible

work with the rest, when she was seized and hurried to jail. At her trial she said little or nothing. Did anything *need* to be said? Was it not all quite plain? Neither judge nor lawyer, friend nor enemy, asked her why she killed her child. The common heart in them all taught them why. She had never heard of Patrick Henry. No word from him had ever reached her across the century. But the same human heart which in him uttered that famous cry for liberty had taught her to put it in practice in presence of a peril more imminent and terrible than any which could threaten him. Friends who visited her in prison to comfort her felt, when they looked upon her face, that words were of no avail. Horace Greeley says, "She seemed simply stupefied and dumb from excess of agony." The anti-slavery lawyers of Cincinnati, led by that noble man, John Jolliffe, a former partner of Governor Chase, exerted themselves to set her at liberty. It was in evidence that her master had some years before voluntarily brought her to Cincinnati in a free State, which, according to all the laws of civilized communities, should have made *her* free. But the commissioner held that her return to slavery, without protest, after having been brought to Ohio, placed her once more in the condition of

a slave. The grand jury of Hamilton County indicted her for the murder of her child, and an effort was made by the proper authorities to hold her for trial. But the United States Court decided that no matter what crimes a man might commit upon the soil of Ohio, he could not be made to answer for them to one of our criminal tribunals after he had once passed into the hands of a United States marshal, under the Fugitive Slave Law. At one stage of the proceedings, Judge Burgoyne, a brave and upright State judge, had issued a writ of Habeas Corpus to bring Margaret before his court to ascertain whether she was lawfully held. Whether by mistake or otherwise, he addressed the writ to the sheriff of the county, an excellent man bearing the name of Buckingham, instead of the United States marshal—a course not at that time authorized by the laws of Ohio. Mr. Buckingham, who had a heart for the work, at first attempted to obtain the custody of Margaret, but soon learning that he was not sustained in this by the law, abandoned his purpose. Margaret was finally delivered to her master, who promised that, on taking her back to a slave State, he would hold her in readiness to be returned to Ohio, in case of a requisition from the Governor, to answer to the charge of

murder. He failed to keep his promise, but sold her down the river into the far South. A single sentence will complete all that is further known of the history of Margaret. It was reported that on her way down the river she either fell or jumped overboard with her infant child—that she was taken from the water, but her child was drowned—that she then exclaimed, "I am thankful that one more of my children is forever free."

This sad affair produced a great effect upon public opinion even in the conservative city of Cincinnati. Ex-President Hayes, who was practicing law in that city at the time, recently told me an incident which, in a way that, if rather rough, is yet picturesque, illustrates this effect. He lived in a street of Southern sympathizers; but, as he expressed it, the whole street was converted by the tragedy of Margaret Garner. The next day after it occurred, a leader among his pro-slavery neighbors called at his house, and as he met Mr. Hayes, exclaimed with great fervor, "Mr. Hayes, hereafter I am with you. From this time forward, I will not only be a Black Republican, but I will be a *damned abolitionist*."

The attempt of Margaret Garner to destroy her children and herself was made on Monday,

January 28, just three weeks after the opening of the General Assembly. The next day the Cincinnati papers came with a full account of the tragedy. The subject was not brought to the attention of the House as an organized body, but was the topic of exciting private conversation in all parts of the hall. At the close of the afternoon session, I returned to my lodgings, and was sitting there in meditation on the startling news, when there was a knock at my door, and Governor Chase entered. He was laboring under great excitement of some kind, and appeared to be angry. He broke out abruptly, "What are you Republicans doing in the House, and what are you doing, Monroe, when a mother who is a free woman is compelled to kill her children on the soil of Ohio to save them from slavery, and that because there is no efficient law for her protection?" I did not remind him that the delay which had been permitted had been in part due to his own counsel. I only said I was most anxious to have something done as soon as possible. He replied, "You ought to introduce a bill into the House in the morning, have it carried through both Houses under a suspension of the rules, and have it become a law before you adjourn to-morrow." I remarked that I should be

delighted to see it done, but he could judge as well as I could whether the temper of the House was such as to admit of this prompt action. We agreed, however, that the bill should be prepared and introduced as soon as possible, and had perhaps two or three conferences as to the form which it should take. We had before us models of similar legislation in the personal liberty bills of some Eastern States; but none of these seemed quite suited to our circumstances. The bill was finally drafted in a form which the situation in Ohio seemed to demand. For the principal feature in it—that which alone made it effective—I was indebted to Governor Chase. It has recently occurred to me that he, in turn, was probably indebted, for the point which he gave me, to the blunder—but a blunder in the right direction—of Judge Burgoyne in sending his writ of Habeas Corpus to the sheriff of the county instead of the United States marshal.

It has been already stated that the great defect of the Habeas Corpus Act of 1811, was that under it the writ was addressed to the officer—State or Federal—who had in his custody the person said to be unlawfully deprived of liberty, and that when this officer was acting under the Fugitive Slave Law, he uniformly

disobeyed the writ. The effective provision of the new bill was that whenever any judge of a State court who is about to issue the writ of Habeas Corpus for the relief of any person alleged to be unlawfully deprived of liberty by an officer, shall become convinced, by affidavit or otherwise, that such officer will not obey the writ, *he shall direct it to the sheriff of the county, who shall proceed with the "power of the county," that is, all the able bodied citizens of the vicinage, and take the person detained out of the custody of the officer detaining him, and bring him before the judge issuing the writ.* This provision was "adequate to the difficulty." It took the victim out of the hands of those who had motives for depriving him of liberty, and placed him in the hands of those who were disposed to give him a fair and impartial trial. It made the judge which issued the writ the final authority, not only as to the correctness of the forms under which the man was held, but also as to the essential lawfulness of the holding; and it forbade, under severe penalties, the re-arrest of any person set at liberty by such a judge. Practically it was an efficient local option law. It is easy to see that any county like Lorain, where the anti-slavery sentiment was strong, would furnish a pretty lively company to

be the sheriff's *posse*. Neither slavery, nor the Fugitive Slave Law, nor even the United States Courts were named in the bill, but it was nevertheless a vigorous procedure. The bill had not much growl or bark in it, but it had plenty of teeth. It was introduced into the House, February 6, but did not pass that body until the 13th of March. On the 1st of April it passed the Senate, and on the fifth of that month became a law. Nearly all of the Republicans in both Houses finally voted for it, and the names of most of the Democrats were recorded against it.

It will be seen that it took longer to get the bill through the House than any of us had expected. As usually happens in such cases, there were questions to be answered, objections to be met, difficulties to be overcome. There was ignorance to be enlightened, prejudice to be removed, unfairness to be borne, irritation to be allayed. The old Free-soilers of the House worked earnestly for the accomplishment of the object, and the Governor lent his assistance in private conversation with members. A bill of five sections was thus carried safely through without an amendment. Two years it remained upon the statute book, affording effective protection to personal liberty. At the end of

that time, the Democrats returned to power, and repealed it. Two years later still, the Republicans regained control of the State, and would have restored the law, but that the war was now at hand, promising remedies for our evils more thorough and complete than any we had previously dared to propose.

While the new Habeas Corpus Act was pending in the House, I had further studied the condition of the juvenile offenders of the State. I found that they already existed in considerable numbers. A mere statement of the disposition made of them would seem to have been all the argument that was needed to secure legislation in their behalf. Through mistaken compassion for their tender age or for parents and other relatives, the larger part of them were permitted to go on in criminal courses, without punishment or correction of any kind. In response to some tearful appeal, prosecutions were waived, or if not, conviction did not follow. A smaller number were confined, for a time, in the county jail, and a number still smaller were sentenced to the Penitentiary. In the jail, it was probable, and in the Penitentiary it was certain, that they would associate with old and hardened offenders. In obedience to a resolution of inquiry introduced into the House

by myself, the Committee on the Penitentiary reported that, in the winter of 1856, there were twenty-five juvenile convicts in our State prison ranging from twelve to seventeen years of age. As the first step in the needed reform, I prepared, with the assistance of Judge Thrall of Columbus, who had had experience in matters of this kind at the East, a bill the object of which was to establish a school in which juvenile criminals and other incorrigible youth should be taught the common branches of education, should learn useful trades, and should be subjected to a system of strict but not unkind restraint and correction. They were to be well fed, clothed, and sheltered, and to be made in all respects comfortable, during good behavior. They might have firecrackers on the 4th of July, a turkey for Thanksgiving, a plum pudding at Christmas, and nuts and apples on New Year's. But they were to be required to study and to work the proper number of hours, to observe all wholesome rules, and when obstinately disobedient, they might be shut up on bread and water, or receive a good family whipping. My bill proposed to accomplish all this by the erection of one large building in the city of Columbus, as in the case of other public institutions. But on a comparison of views with my fellow-members,

this idea was gradually superseded, in my own mind as well as in the minds of others, by that of a large farm with numerous cottages scattered over it. The latter plan was also the more acceptable one to the friends of retrenchment, who were numerous in the House. They strongly opposed making a heavy appropriation the first year, preferring to wait until they should have a better understanding of the system to be adopted and the results to be achieved. It was partly in compliance with their wishes, for I needed their help, that the bill finally assumed the modest form of appropriating a small sum to pay the salaries and expenses of three commissioners, whose duty it should be to visit reform schools already established, and study their system, and methods, and the construction of their buildings; to employ an architect and prepare plans for buildings; to make inquiry for a suitable site for the school; to receive proposals for donations of money and lands, and to make full report of these and other matters to the next session of the General Assembly within ten days after the time of its opening. The bill in this form, with several other sections of detail, passed the House, March 29, the Senate, April 5, and on April 7, became a law. The commissioners

appointed by the Governor were, John A. Foote of Cleveland, Charles Remelin of Cincinnati, and James D. Ladd of New Richmond, who, for many years, rendered efficient, valuable, and self-denying service in connection with this enterprise. The commissioners duly reported the next winter after the passage of the bill, recommending the purchase of a farm near Lancaster and the erection of buildings upon it; and the General Assembly cheerfully appropriated the money necessary for these purposes. It was my privilege from this time until 1862, either in the House or Senate, to prepare, with the assistance of the commissioners, and to take charge of all bills making appropriations for the maintenance and enlargement of this work. In 1886, the farm at Lancaster contained 1,210 acres covered with numerous buildings. The number of boys in the school was 575, and the total number of inmates from the beginning had been 4,652. Some years after the founding of the school for boys, it was thought necessary to establish one for girls, which was done at White Sulphur Springs, near Delaware. The average number here has been 285, and the total number from the beginning 934. Recently a second boys' school has been established at Toledo, where

the average number of inmates has been 160, and the total number 864.

My duty to the common schools of the State was to be discharged by maintaining a masterly inactivity. To protect the school law against hostile amendments was the thing to be done. My position as chairman of the standing Committee on Common Schools aided in the accomplishment of this object. Numerous petitions asking for injurious amendments to the law, and especially for a dangerous limitation of the power of taxation under it, were referred to the committee. With these came bills which had been introduced into the House to secure this end. Both bills and petitions were duly considered in committee, carefully filed, and tied up in neat packages with red tape. Some impatience was manifested at the slow progress of the committee, and a suspicion was expressed that we were disposed to defer action until it should be too late to legislate upon the subject. At length, near the close of the session, the committee made a report accompanied by a bill. The bill proposed such amendments to the law as would not impair its efficiency, and the report contained an argument, prepared with some care, against any radical change in the school system of the State. This view of the

question, if not adopted, was at least acquiesced in, by the House, and the disposition to amend the school law in any way that would diminish its usefulness to the youth of the commonwealth, gradually disappeared from the Legislature.

One more of the obligations which I had assumed, I tried to discharge during the second session of this General Assembly, by introducing an amendment to the Constitution to strike the word "white" from the paragraph relating to suffrage. I delivered a carefully prepared speech on the subject, which I believe had the merit, if you choose to consider it such, of being the first speech ever made in the Ohio Legislature on that side of the question. There were perhaps twenty-five Republicans in the House who would have voted with me in favor of this amendment, and it had been my intention to demand the yeas and nays upon its passage, and put everybody upon the record. As the time approached, however, to do this, earnest representations were made to me by Republican members that it would do no good to call up the amendment for a final vote—that I knew as well as they did that it could not pass—that to insist upon a vote now would divide the party and produce bitter feeling—that it would commit against the amendment

some candid men who were rather friendly to it, but had not yet fully made up their minds—that it would injure the prospects of some young members whose districts were so divided in opinion, that for them to vote either way would be political ruin—that to push the issue further would drive the conservatives from our party, and give the next election to the Democrats—in fine, that public opinion was not ripe for negro suffrage, and that I must have the grace to wait. These arguments do not sound very satisfactory. They were not altogether to my taste at the time. But they are very familiar to a man who has acted with any party numerous enough to control legislative bodies. In a free country there seems to be only this alternative: You may have a party sound to the last man upon the desired reform but so few in numbers that it is difficult to pick them out of the election returns, or, you may have a party strong enough to control the state or even the nation but prone, as regards the advanced thought, to hesitate, to compromise, to defer. What we want, of course, is a party both perfectly pure and overwhelmingly strong. Unfortunately neither the history of our own country nor that of England gives us an example of any such party. The arguments against a vote

on my amendment did not seem very conclusive. But on reflection, whether wisely or unwisely, I decided not to demand the final vote. When I reached home I was severely criticised, both for the amendment in itself as being narrow and illiberal, and also for the manner in which I had dropped it.

The matters thus presented were the principal part of my work in my first legislative experience. Doubtless I did some other things. I was a member of the standing Committee on the Penitentiary, which had investigations to conduct and reforms to institute. I was made chairman of the select committee to revise the rules of the House, on the principle, I suppose, that as I knew nothing about rules, it was time I learned something. The Senator from this district, Mr. Herman Canfield of Medina, was the author of the bill to establish an asylum for imbecile youth. He got this bill through the Senate in the winter of 1857, and asked me to look after its passage in the House. I was glad to do what I could for so worthy an object.

Many members of this General Assembly did good work—some of them more of it than I did. Mr. Alfred Kelley, of Columbus, who was known to us as the father of the canal system of the State, carried through several useful bills

relating to taxation, finance, banking and currency. Senator Brown, of Portage County, introduced a bill to prevent slaveholding in Ohio; Senator Hawley, of Lawrence, a bill to punish kidnapping; Senator Guthrie, of Morgan, a bill to prohibit the confinement of fugitive slaves in our jails. All these bills became laws. An excellent law was passed, copied I believe from that of Massachusetts, reorganizing the benevolent institutions of the State. This was introduced and carried through by Representative Brayton, of Cuyahoga.

Among the many other able and influential members of this Legislature, might be mentioned Representatives George Mygatt of Cuyahoga, Darius Cadwell of Ashtabula, Ralph Plumb of Trumbull, Cyrus Mendenhall of Jefferson, George M. Parsons of Franklin, Alfred Yaple of Ross, and William M. Corry of Hamilton; and Senators Lester Taylor of Geauga, Hiram Griswold of Cuyahoga, Ralph P. Buckland of Sandusky, Robert C. Kirk of Knox, John T. Brazee of Fairfield, and Stanley Matthews of Hamilton. Several of these gentlemen afterwards achieved distinguished judicial position in the courts of the State or nation, or took a prominent place in one or the other of the two Houses of Congress.

As regards my own work in this General Assembly, I had the feeling, at its close, that I had made a fairly good record, and I looked forward to the approval of my constituents. Their reception of me when I reached home, was, on the whole, not unfavorable; but to this there were some exceptions so marked as to make my life for some months anything but dull and uninteresting. But if I should ever give you an account of this, it must be on some future occasion.

MY FIRST LEGISLATIVE EXPERIENCE.

II.

RECEPTION BY THE PEOPLE.

A THURSDAY LECTURE.

FOUR years since, I gave you some account, in this place, of my first legislative experience —of the state of feeling and opinion and the condition and aims of parties in the first Republican General Assembly of Ohio—of some bills which I introduced into that body and of the degree of success which attended them. There was a bill so to amend the Habeas Corpus Act as to protect the personal liberty of our citizens against the aggressions of the slave power, and a bill for the establishment of Reform Schools—both of which became laws. There was a bill to submit to the people an amendment to the State Constitution striking the word "white" from the paragraph relating to the right of suffrage, which failed to pass.

There was also a successful effort to prevent injurious amendments to an improved school law which had lately gone into effect.

But there may said to be two sides to a man's legislative experience: One of these is the work which he does, or attempts to do; the other is the manner in which it is received by the people. There is the standpoint of the representative and the standpoint of his constituents. The former of these topics was presented in my last address; the latter is the subject for the present occasion. The discussion of it may not be wholly without interest, if it shall give, to some extent, a picture of the time, as it was, thirty-seven years ago.

I mentioned, in my first address, that when I returned to my constituents, at the close of the General Assembly, the reception which they gave me was, on the whole, not unfavorble; but that there were some exceptions to this so marked as to relieve my life, for some time, from all feeling of monotony. I bore up stoutly in all cases where my work was merely forgotten or ignored. An honest farmer from the rural districts would sometimes remark, when I met him, that he had not seen me on the street for some time past, and would ask whether I had not been out of town. This

was a little trying, but I could account for it on the ground of the remoteness of his home from the centers of intelligence. But sharp, and as it seemed to me unjust, criticism was harder to bear. Those who were satisfied with my course were more numerous than those who were not; but the latter were more aggressive, and had more to say.

The first severe criticism of my legislative acts of which I heard, arose from a vote which I gave in favor of what was known as the Covington and Cincinnati bridge bill. The circumstances of the case were the following:—In 1846, the Legislature of Kentucky gave a charter to the Covington and Cincinnati Bridge Company, which was organized for the purpose of constructing a bridge between those two towns across the Ohio River. This charter was granted on the condition that the company should be held responsible for all fugitive slaves that should escape across the bridge. It was necessary that the charter should be confirmed by the Legislature of Ohio; and this was done without difficulty in the Session of 1849, when the Democrats were in power. The privileges of the bridge company had now become a vested right in accordance with principles established by the decisions of the highest courts.

In the Legislature of 1856, to which I had been elected, no one contended that we had any right to repeal the charter, however distasteful it might be to us; and had we passed an act to do this, the Supreme Court would no doubt have pronounced it unconstitutional. That the navigation of the Ohio River might not be impeded, the original charter had provided that the bridge should not have less than a certain span and rise. It was subsequently discovered, however, that these might be considerably diminished without interfering with the commerce of the river. Hence, in the Session of 1856, the company petitioned for the passage of a bill which should so amend their charter that the bridge might be built of less span and rise than what had been originally required, and thus save a large amount of money. Some of the radical Free-soilers promptly said that they would never vote for the bill—that they would not aid in granting favors to any company which endorsed the false and barbarous claim of the master by contracting to pay for his escaped slaves. In the phrase of the day, they declared that the bridge was a "pro-slavery" bridge, and that a vote to shorten it or to diminish its height or reduce the expenditure for it was a "pro-slavery" vote. I felt compelled

to take a different view of the matter. To me it seemed plain that, inasmuch as it was not possible, under the law, to repeal the charter or to take the obnoxious element out of it, the only question which I could affect by my vote was the question whether the company should be compelled to waste fifty or a hundred thousand dollars—to spend so much more than there was any need of—to put that amount into bridge structure which nobody wanted. I decided therefore to vote for the bill. I said, It is not a question of pro-slavery or anti-slavery. It is merely a question whether we shall compel men to throw away good money. To say that they shall do so is not so much high principle as a want of common kindness, not to say of common sense. This decision cost me some tribulation among a portion of my fellow-members. I was charged with having sacrificed principle to policy, and it was intimated that I had mistaken my calling, if I thought myself fitted to be an anti-slavery leader. Well, they may have been right about the matter; but after the lapse of thirty-seven years, I am unable to take any different view of the case from what I then did.

My trials in connection with this question might have been confined to the Legislature, had it not been for that great enlightener and

civilizer, the press. Mr. Josiah A. Harris, one of the editors of the "Cleveland Herald," was passing the winter in Columbus, as a correspondent of that paper. He was my good friend, but was strongly opposed to the Covington and Cincinnati bridge bill. Before the vote was taken, he kindly came to my seat, and said that he intended to severely censure in the "Herald" all Republicans who should vote for this bill—that he did not wish to attack me, and hence had given me this timely notice, so that I could withhold my support from the measure. I told him that I should greatly regret being the object of his censure, but that I really thought the bill both innocent and useful. Besides, I was fully committed to it before the House, and could not now abandon it. I voted for the bill, and he kept his word. The promised attack appeared. Two or three years since, being one day in the city of Cleveland, it occurred to me that I would try to find, and once more read, this old attack. To that end, I climbed the long steep staircase of the old Savings Bank Building on my way to the Museum of the Western Reserve Historical Society, which perhaps contains the only nearly complete file of the "Cleveland Herald" now in existence, from its beginning in 1819 down to the time, a few years since, when it

ceased to be published. There, safe and sound, in one of the numbers near the close of March, 1856, I found the Columbus letter of Mr. Harris in which my vote was criticised. It was quite a grief to me when it first appeared, but the day when my search was rewarded by a re-perusal of it, I suppose I was the only human being living in the world who remembered that such an article had ever been published. You can readily understand that an article like this printed in a paper of general circulation in Lorain County and in Oberlin, among a people justly sensitive to anything relating to slavery, would bring upon me much criticism; and such was the fact. But I never made any public defense of my vote. It was one of the cases in which people cannot be reasoned with.

A friend of mine who had also voted for the bill, told me that he had defended himself by saying that the only question before the House was whether the bridge should be a long one or a short one—that it was a doctrine of his that a runaway negro could get across a short bridge quicker than he could get across a long one, and hence he had voted to shorten the bridge. But I suppose that even this reasoning was not satisfactory.

I have mentioned this issue of the bridge not

because it is one of great importance in itself, but because it is a good type of a large class of questions which are constantly arising when reforms are under discussion—questions about which men equally honest but of different temperament, education, and philosophy, are constantly dividing. There is no help for it. Such differences will always exist, and in regard to them, if anywhere, there is room for the largest charity. In such cases, it is simply a question of judgment as to which of two courses, under the circumstances, will best conduce to valued ends. But it is difficult to have it so regarded. The man who votes against the bridge is always tempted to think that he is the only man that has any principle; and the man who votes for it that he is the only man that has any fairness and candor.

But perhaps the severest censure of which I was the object, was directed against the legislation which I had attempted in regard to slavery and the colored people, or, to use the current phrase, the effort which I had made for "the cause of freedom." This censure came from a class of true men, still, at that time, found, in small numbers, in most townships of Lorain County, who had been members of the old Liberty party, but had not approved of the Free-Soil party of

1848, nor its successors the Free Democracy of 1852, and the Republican party of 1856. They were dissatisfied with me because I was a Republican, and also because they had expected me, as an old abolitionist, to take more radical ground in the Legislature. A majority of the Liberty party united with the Free-Soil party, but these men, who, as a class, were among the most self-denying workers that the cause had had, refused to follow their old associates into the new organization. They declared that it was not a continuation nor even the legitimate successor of the Liberty party. The frankness of speech by which they had always been characterized did not fail them now. They charged that the Free-Soil movement of 1848 was a deliberate sacrifice of principle for the sake of numbers and of power. The Liberty party, they said, had made principle paramount, and had been content with such following as could be obtained consistently with this. The Free-Soil party was willing to surrender so much of principle as was necessary to secure the accession to its ranks of the New York Barnburners, other Free-Soil Democrats, and the Free-Soil Whigs. It meant to carry as much principle as it conveniently could, but it did not intend to be overloaded. Dr. Gamaliel Bailey, the accomplished

editor of the "National Era," referring to the Buffalo platform says:—The resolutions "embrace all the truth necessary to be presented and urged in this present crisis." Mr. William Goodell, one of the noblest of the anti-slavery reformers, states that more than a year before the convention of 1848 was held, unequivocal indications had already appeared "of the speedy absorption of the Liberty party in some other organization holding a receding instead of an advanced position in respect to slavery." He plainly intimates that the nomination of Hale and King in 1847, ostensibly in the interest of the Liberty party, was made, not in good faith, but through the efforts of interested leaders and contrary to the appeals of the more earnest men, to amuse and hold Liberty men for a time, until they could be transferred to a new party with lower aims. Gentlemen who were active in the nomination of Mr. Hale, were soon found uniting with men of other political parties in calling, upon the simple basis of resistance to slavery extension, a convention to be held at Buffalo, where Mr. Hale was superseded by Mr. Van Buren.

The feeling of distrust with which Gerrit Smith, Mr. Goodell, and their friends regarded the new party, was strengthened by the platform

adopted by the Buffalo Convention, when it met. In their judgment, that platform offered to the country a party defensive rather than aggressive, and hence a party disqualified to lead in the contest with the slaveholding power. The National Liberty Convention, which nominated Birney and Morris in 1843, had not only declared itself to be unalterably opposed to any increase of slave territory and to the admission of any new slave State—it had not only demanded the absolute and unqualified divorce of the General Government from slavery, but it gave numerous specifications of what it believed to be both constitutional and obligatory methods of attacking slavery. It passed resolutions in favor of abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia and in all national territory, and of abolishing the coastwise slave trade. It declared that the clause of the Constitution in regard to the return of fugitives, as commonly interpreted, was a nullity, because contrary to natural right—that the Government had no right to use its prerogative of diplomacy and the treaty-making power in the interest of slavery—that the power given to Congress by the Constitution to call out the militia to suppress insurrection, does not make it the duty of the Government to maintain slavery by force—in a

word, that the powers of the Government should always be wielded for freedom, never against it, and that slavery should be left isolated, quarantined, hemmed in, and dependent wholly for existence upon the local law. The platform further declared it to be the duty of the free States to enact laws making it a penal offense for their citizens to engage in the business of returning fugitive slaves. Now the doctrines of this platform were strictly within the limits of power conferred by the Constitution, but they were aggressive—they meant the destruction of slavery—they were drawn up by men who had no wish to get office, or get their party into power, or enlarge their numbers by dropping any cherished principle.

But when the reformers turned from this platform to that of the Free-Soil Convention of 1848, they discovered a marked contrast. The Buffalo platform did indeed announce in unmistakable terms, and with a kind of rhetorical alacrity, its hostility to any further extension of slavery. Its battle-cry in the campaign was, "No more Slave states—no more slave territory." It also declared that the Government should "relieve itself from all responsibility for the existence or continuance of slavery," wherever it possessed constitutional authority to

legislate on that subject. But it did not name any locality where the Government possessed such constitutional authority. It did not state that there *was* any such locality. If there was any portion of territory where the Government had power to legislate upon slavery, there it ought to relieve itself of all responsibility for it. The question whether there *was* any such territory, appears to have been left for each member of the party to decide for himself. The framers of this platform avoided the details which gave meaning and force to the Liberty platform of 1843, but which would have produced sharp divisions in the Convention at Buffalo.

This interpretation of the spirit of the Free-Soil platform—an interpretation commonly put upon it by the more radical anti-slavery men—was confirmed by the candidate of the new party, Martin Van Buren, in his letter of acceptance. He commended the platform for having, in his opinion, followed the policy of the fathers, in showing, to use his own words, "a spirit of considerate forbearance towards the institution in localities where it was placed under the control of Congress." He spoke with evident satisfaction of the fact that the sixth resolution which made it the duty of the Government to

relieve itself of all responsibility for slavery, employed, as he puts it, "a generality of expression" which had "not been usual" among "the friends of immediate action." He added, in substance, that he thought he saw in "the guarded language of the resolution" evidence of differences of opinion in the Convention, "and of an enlightened and truly patriotic resolve" not to introduce into the platform anything which would conflict with these differences. It may be urged that Mr. Van Buren put too conservative an estimate upon the platform. But Mr. Goodell well says, "It is not known that leading members of the Convention that nominated Mr. Van Buren, ever complained that he had misunderstood their position."

But the general political character of the candidate of the Buffalo Convention, as well as its platform, showed that the policy of the new movement was greatly changed from that of the Liberty party. Mr. Van Buren was nominated August 10, 1848. In a letter dated the twentieth of the previous June, and read before the Utica Convention, he had stated that it was a source of consolation to him that, when President of the United States, he was determined that no effort on his part should be

wanting to sustain what were known as the Compromises of the Constitution on the subject of slavery. That this compliment paid by Mr. Van Buren to himself was merited, is evident from expressions of approval which he received from leading slaveholders who were considered good judges of the loyalty of their followers. The men who nominated Mr. Van Buren at Buffalo had been in the habit of speaking of him as "a Northern man with Southern principles." Henry Wilson, himself a supporter of Mr. Van Buren, says, "Could they have foreseen his subsequent course they might have hesitated. But they were prepared to forgive and forget the past and hope much for the future." What Mr. Van Buren's subsequent course was is well known. After his brief coquetting with the Free-Soil movement, he returned to the bosom of the Hunker Democracy and aided in the election of its candidates.

A considerable number of the old Liberty men refused to join a party with such a platform and such a candidate. They failed to see in its banners, with their strange devices, the standards which they had sworn to follow in battle. It had indeed declared that Congress had "no more power to make a slave than to make a king." But could it have named no

spot where Congress had power to unmake a slave? Must the clanking of fetters still be heard under the windows of the Capitol? Must companies of manacled slaves still move in sad procession near the National Court of Justice and past the doors of Christian churches in the city of Washington? Must the outcry of the auction block still be heard but a few squares away from that Hall where patriotic orators were wont to set forth to admiring Congressmen the glories of this land of freedom? Why was there this mysterious shrinking from the assertion of the power to emancipate? Here a blow might have been struck that slaveholders would have felt—that would have shaken the whole land, would have awakened a sympathetic response from millions of freemen, and would have been the beginning of the end. Why should the Government, in the language of Martin Van Buren, exhibit "a spirit of considerate forbearance towards the institution in localities where it was placed under the control of Congress"? One would have thought those would have been just the localities in which to destroy it. The Liberty men I have described felt that they could not sustain a party which had exhibited such weakness on so vital a question. They did not regard it as their party.

In this they were abundantly sustained by many men like Dr. Bailey, who had left the Liberty party for that of the Free-soilers. In the "National Era," he rebuked Liberty men who, having gone with him into the new organization, claimed that it was the same as the old. Speaking of the Convention of 1848, he says:—

"That Convention was neither a 'Liberty,' a 'Conscience Whig,' nor 'Barnburning' Convention. It was an assemblage of the people, without regard to party names or attachments, for an object cherished by the people above all mere party objects. It organized neither a 'Barnburning,' 'Conscience Whig,' nor 'Liberty' party. People assembled for no such purpose. The vassalage of some minds to party names is ridiculous. A Liberty paper in the East talks complacently of the Convention having adopted the Liberty platform: reorganized the Liberty party. We shall expect to hear, in other quarters, something about the true Whig or the true Democratic platform. Why cannot men rise above these small distinctions?"

The disapproval with which many Liberty men regarded the party of 1848 was extended, though in somewhat modified form, to the Free Democracy of 1852 and the Republicans of 1856. Even at a later period, some of them made bitter

attacks upon the administration of Abraham Lincoln. They regarded the new party as having been, from the beginning, one of compromise for the sake of power, rather than one of principle.

I may add that when the Free-Soil party was formed in 1848, my sympathies were with the earnest abolitionists who refused to join it. I liked neither the candidate nor the platform. I thought those Liberty men were right who said that the Free-Soil party was not the one to which they had belonged. It did not meet my ideal of the party which the times demanded. I knew there were thousands of honest anti-slavery men in it, but they had been misled. I did not vote for Van Buren and Adams. I kept aloof from the new party for some time. During this interval, with my friend Professor Hudson, I voted for such men as we believed to be reliable, without any thought of influencing an election. Each successive year the men who voted as we did became fewer and fewer. I might have continued voting in the straight line of succession to Gerrit Smith and William Goodell until this time, had it not come clear to me one day, as I was thinking it over, that, in a country where suffrage is universal, you cannot carry a great national reform without

votes. Most of the anti-slavery voters had gone into the Republican party. Many of them found the standards of opinion lower than they desired, but they were constantly striving, and with a good degree of success, to elevate them. I finally decided that my place was with these men. If the new party were not moving as fast as I could wish, they were, perhaps, moving as fast as public opinion would sustain. If they were not trying to carry out all the truth which I deemed important, they were trying to carry out some of it, and what they were trying to do it seemed probable they would soon have strength enough to accomplish. I became willing that anti-slavery principles should be brought forward one at a time, if, by so doing, a party could be secured strong enough to give to each successive principle a triumph. I was content to accept, first, the doctrine of no more slave territory—next the abolition of slavery throughout all the national domain—next the partial abolition of slavery in the States—next its total abolition everywhere, and finally the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments —"first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear." Hungry men might wish that the full corn in the ear should be produced at once, but the constitution of nature is

otherwise. It seemed a pity not to be able to do all the desired good at once, but there was compensation for the delay in the increased numerical strength which the delay secured. I came to the conclusion that, in the present condition of the world, it would not be practicable to organize a party with votes enough to accomplish anything, whose average moral tone would not be below the just standard. Hence I voted for Hale and Julian in 1852, and thenceforward acted with the Republican party. How could I stay out of the new movement, when, far within its ranks, was heard the voice of Whittier, who, at first, distrusted the party, but had finally joined it—the voice of Whittier singing his paean of joy of hope of thankfulness, of inspiration, in lines like these:—

Now, joy and thanks forevermore!
The dreary night has wellnigh passed,
The slumbers of the North are o'er,
The Giant stands erect at last!

More than we hoped in that dark time
When, faint with watching, few and worn,
We saw no welcome day-star climb
The cold gray pathway of the morn!

* * * * * * * *

How jeered the scoffing crowd behind,
How mocked before the tyrant train,
As, one by one, the true and kind
Fell fainting in our path of pain!

They died,—their brave hearts breaking slow,—
But, self-forgetful to the last,
In words of cheer and bugle blow
Their breath upon the darkness passed.

A mighty host, on either hand,
Stood waiting for the dawn of day
To crush like reeds our feeble band;
The morn has come,—and where are they?

* * * * * * * *

Like mist before the growing light,
The hostile cohorts melt away;
Our frowning foemen of the night
Are brothers at the dawn of day!

* * * * * * * *

Sound for the onset!—Blast on blast!
Till Slavery's minions cower and quail;
One charge of fire shall drive them fast
Like chaff before our Northern gale!

O prisoners in your house of pain,
Dumb, toiling millions, bound and sold,
Look! stretched o'er Southern vale and plain,
The Lord's delivering hand behold!

Above the tyrant's pride of power,
His iron gates and guarded wall,
The bolts which shattered Shinar's tower
Hang, smoking, for a fiercer fall.

Awake! awake! my Fatherland!
It is thy Northern light that shines;
This stirring march of Freedom's band
The storm-song of thy mountain pines.

Wake, dwellers where the day expires!
And hear, in winds that sweep your lakes
And fan your prairies' roaring fires,
The signal-call that Freedom makes!

This signal-call I obeyed. It was the position which I had thus reached in the Republican party and the new philosophy which I had adopted—that of getting what I could from the party at the time, and working and hoping for more, which brought upon me the criticism of the old Liberty men who had remained faithful to the earlier idea. They thought poorly of my Habeas Corpus Act. They did not understand it very well; but this did not much interfere with or modify the severity of their censure. It hurled no defiance at slavery and the Fugitive Slave Law. It did not even contain the words. In their judgment the General Assembly of Ohio ought to have taken the lead in the championship of certain radical constitutional doctrines in regard to slavery and in putting these doctrines, as far as practicable, into the form of law. They felt that the representative of Lorain County should have been active in a movement of this kind, and that he had not done so was a signal failure in duty. These worthy men also sharply criticised my not calling up and demanding the yeas and nays upon

the bill submitting to a vote of the people an amendment to the Constitution striking the word "white" from the suffrage clause. They contended that every member of the House should have been compelled to go upon the record on this question, and that it was a great weakness on my part to have listened to the request of members to be released from this. The criticism of these old abolitionists I felt more keenly than that from any other source, my sympathy with them had been so strong in the past.

But the liveliest critics which I had on my return home after my first General Assembly were the Woman Suffragists. They were disgusted that, as a professed reformer, I should have proposed an amendment to the Constitution to strike out the word "white" and not strike out the word "male." They said, "Will you give an ignorant negro the right to vote and withhold it from your own mother, wife, sister, and daughter?"—none of whom, however, wanted it. They evidently thought worse of me than they would have done had I made no effort at all to amend the Constitution. But they kindly undertook a plan for my conversion, which, however, was carefully kept from me until it could be carried into effect. About two

miles east of Oberlin lived a Mr. Porter, who was a warm advocate of Woman Suffrage. He was never married, but this did not make him less disposed to enlarge the powers of woman. An appointment was made for him, by his friends, to speak on his favorite subject in some hall on West College Street on a certain evening. Just before the meeting was held, my old and highly esteemed friend, Ralph Plumb, afterwards an able and useful member of Congress from Streator, Illinois, called at my study, spoke of the coming entertainment, and, saying that he believed me to be a man willing to hear both sides of the question, invited me to attend the meeting. I innocently consented. When I entered the hall, I found a number of middle-aged gentlemen and worthy matrons of the town already assembled. As I passed to my seat, they maintained, externally, the utmost seriousness, but you will soon understand what must have been the feeling within that was hidden under this grave demeanor. Mr. Porter had not advanced far with his address before I discovered that he was reading a speech of mine delivered before the Ohio House of Representatives in favor of striking the word "white" from the Constitution, nearly word for word, except that he was everywhere substituting the

word "male" for the word "white," and the word "woman" for the words "colored man." I had to listen to this for a full hour. There was no decent way of escape. The whole meeting had evidently been called on my account. Those present were, no doubt, more occupied in watching the effect of the address upon me than in listening to it for their own benefit; and I will confess that I was somewhat taken by surprise, myself, to find how plausibly the argument sounded, when applied to the right of woman to the ballot. At the close of the meeting we went quietly home. Mr. Porter had committed a fearful plagiarism, but I never called him to account for it. It was believed that, if "Brother Monroe" was at all candid, he must be converted by this experience. But the expected result did not follow. Perhaps the error consisted in assuming that a man could remain in a candid state of mind when compelled to listen to his own speeches. But, wherever the mistake lay, my opinions remained unchanged. Thereupon followed, in private circles, and perhaps in some public meetings, sharp denunciations of the Republican party, and, I fear, of myself also. Their mode of reasoning with us was something like the following:—

"You Republicans have begun, so far as your power and influence go, by robbing one-half the human race of their natural, fundamental, God-given rights. Upon this rotten foundation, you are trying to build up what you call a superstructure of reform. It is no reform. Your work is narrow, partial, prejudiced, and insincere. It has no principle at the bottom of it. It is mere pretense—it is hypocrisy—to profess such concern for the rights of a small fraction of the human family while ignoring the claims of a much larger portion. You talk about destroying slavery, but God will never bless, will never use such an instrumentality as you are to so noble an end. The Bible shows—all history shows—that no reform has ever been attended with success, unless resting on a sound basis of principle."

These sharp reproofs did not seem, for the present, to be joyous but grievous; but they were, no doubt, the answer of a good conscience to those who administered them, and to Republicans, and to myself in particular, they were at least disciplinary. I remember a Mr. and Mrs. Swift, then resident in Oberlin, who were specially faithful to me.

Such were some of the elements of dissatisfaction which existed in my district, at the

close of my first period of service. In the aggregate they seemed rather formidable. There were those, I suppose, who said that I could never be re-nominated. The mass of Republicans, however, had taken little part in these discussions, and it was difficult to say what they were thinking. But when the township meetings were held, the following August, they appear to have attended. The critics disappeared, and delegates were chosen for the Legislative Convention who gave me a unanimous re-nomination.

A JOURNEY TO VIRGINIA IN DECEMBER, 1859.

A THURSDAY LECTURE.

It must have been on, or very near, Saturday morning, December 17, 1859—indeed I think it was that very morning—that an incident occurred in the parlor of my house, then on South Professor Street, which has taken its place in memory as one of the most pathetic experiences of my life. A father and mother, neighbors whom I knew, came to my door and asked for an interview. They were Mr. and Mrs. John Copeland—people, in part, of African blood, of respectable standing in the community, and of amiable and Christian deportment. A son of these parents is still favorably known among us as a business partner of Mr. Charles Glenn, the builder. As I received them, I saw that they were in deep distress. The mother especially, exhibited such intense suffering—suffering so affecting both body and mind—that it was a question whether she would not sink to the floor, in utter

exhaustion, before the conference could be completed. Their story is soon told. A son of the family, John A. Copeland, a young man about twenty-six years of age, had gone, some months before, to Chatham, in Canada, to visit a married sister. While there he had met an agent of John Brown, who invited him to join in the Virginia raid. Enthusiastic for the deliverance of both the races with which he was identified from the curse of slavery, and an ardent admirer of Brown, he accepted the invitation. With the result of the raid we are all acquainted. Brown was executed December 2, 1859, at Charlestown, Virginia. On the sixteenth day of December, came the execution of Copeland, at the same place. I have in my possession a letter, written by him on that day to his parents, brothers, and sisters in Oberlin, within two hours probably of the time of his ascending the scaffold, which, in its exhibition of Christian peace, of a spirit of forgiveness, of domestic affection, and of profound calm, will not compare unfavorably with any of the last utterances of apostles and martyrs. You will see that the day of his execution was the one immediately preceding that of the visit of his parents to me. I have spoken of the extreme suffering of Mrs. Copeland. It was noticeable,

however, that the grief which tortured her did not spring mainly from the thought of her son's execution. That, comparatively, seemed a tolerable affliction. John Brown had been executed, and so had been many of the great and good. The gallows upon which her son perished seemed irradiated by the goodly fellowship in suffering of prophets and reformers. This could be borne. The intolerable agony was caused by a report, which had come over the wires, and which appeared to be well founded, that the body of her son had been, or soon would be, taken to the medical college at Winchester, Virginia, for the purposes of dissection, About this she seemed to have a feeling akin to superstition. She had lain awake all night, turning the painful subject over in every form that a morbid imagination could suggest, until the torture had become more than brain and heart could endure; and unless some diversion —some relief—could be furnished, both brain and heart, it seemed probable, must give way. Under these circumstances, the parents had come to me to ask that I would go promptly to Winchester, and endeavor to recover the body of their son. I did not covet the undertaking, and I thought it right to explain to them that it would be likely to result in failure. Great

excitement still prevailed in Virginia. Soldiers were still marching and counter-marching, military reviews were being held, and that military spirit was being awakened which was maintained from that time until the close of the war. The very presence of a Northern abolitionist in Virginia, upon such an errand in such a state of public feeling, might be regarded as, in itself, a grave offense. It was true that the body of John Brown had been returned to his widow; but special influences had been brought to bear in that case; and besides, Brown had the important advantage that he did not belong to the despised race. I did not fail to present these points to Mrs. Copeland; but they made no impression. She still entreated me to go, and I could not refuse her. I suppose I never pitied any one so much in my whole life.

Having decided to undertake the journey, I at once made such preparation as I could. From Hiram Griswold, a prominent lawyer of Cleveland who had acted as Brown's attorney during his trial, I obtained a letter of introduction to Judge Parker of Winchester—the Judge who had sentenced both Brown and Copeland. Mr. Copeland, the father, or some friend for him, had telegraphed to Henry A. Wise, then Governor of Virginia, asking permission

to send some one into the State to obtain the body of his son. A telegram came in reply which read in substance:—"You may send a man, but he must be a white man." This telegram I took with me, together with a paper from Mr. Copeland authorizing me to act as his agent in receiving the body.

I was now fairly well equipped for my journey, except that I had no money for the payment of expenses; and my friend Copeland was almost as impecunious as I was. In this exigency, James M. Fitch, who was for many years a bookseller and publisher in Oberlin, and whose memory is still held in reverence for his many good works, brought me one hundred dollars which he had somehow obtained in the town. I fear he had secured it by solicitation from door to door among business men and other citizens—a method of raising money which even to this day is something more than a tradition among us.

You will say that I now took the first train for Winchester. But this will be because you are too young to have had any experience of those times. In 1859 a man who got together a hundred dollars to go East had perhaps performed the smaller part of the needed financial operation. That was the period of the

state-bank system, or rather of the state-bank systems; for there were as many of them as there were States that chose to legislate upon the subject. The result was that there was an endless variety of paper money, of all degrees of soundness except the highest. In Ohio, besides our own money, we had many kinds of bank bills from Michigan, from Indiana, and from States farther west. Upon these, even when from banks called good, there was a discount of from ten to thirty per cent when exchanged for coin. On looking over the money which I had received, I discovered that it was rich in these varieties, and that it was necessary to ascertain how much its nominal values represented in those which were real; in other words, what was the purchasing power of my hundred dollars. Fortunately for me, we had at that time in Oberlin a business man who was an expert in the quality of paper money. He received the latest counterfeit detectors, and the latest journals giving the rates of discount, at the Eastern money centers, upon all Western bank notes. He was our helpful adviser in our financial troubles. To him I took my money. He went over it with me carefully, and gave me all needed information. So far as it seemed probable that he could use my Western bills in

the way of business, he gave me New York and other Eastern bills in exchange for them. He very much improved the quality of my money—not, I fear, without some loss to himself.

One incident of our interview I have always thought unique. Among the bank notes which Mr. Fitch had brought me, there was a considerable number of one-dollar bills. Of these perhaps twelve or fifteen were on the Northern Bank of Kentucky. My friend smiled when he saw them. "These," said he, "are all counterfeit. See how distressed the face of old Harry Clay looks on these notes. But although they are counterfeit, you will have no trouble with them. There is such a scarcity of small bills that business men, by common consent, receive them and pay them out."

In regard to the scarcity of small bills at that time, I might add, that it was, in part, due to the decided stand taken by one of the political parties in favor of the use of coin. To promote this, they discouraged, and sometimes prohibited, through the State legislatures, the issuing of small notes, their theory being that, as a vacuum would thus be produced, and as nature abhors a vacuum, gold and silver would flow in to fill it. But gold and silver did not flow in, for it turned out that the

vacuum abhorred gold and silver worse than nature abhorred the vacuum. Then, as always, no way was discovered to induce men to use the dearest money that could be found to meet their obligations. The most patriotic Whig or Democrat would not go to a broker's and buy coin at a premium to pay small debts, when, by letting them run until they were larger, he could pay them in depreciated bills of higher denomination, or, perhaps, could pay them at once, by barter.

I was somewhat startled by my friend's liberal views and what he told me of the practice under them. It was an anomaly which only the general financial disorder could have produced. I have thought this the most remarkable case of fiat money of which I have any knowledge. Here there was no government behind these bills declaring them to be money. The only fiat that gave them currency was an understanding tacitly reached by business men, and based upon a supposed public convenience. Our Populist friends would, perhaps, find fresh confirmation for their views, in a case like this.

I left Oberlin for Winchester, Monday, December 19, going by way of Wheeling and Harper's Ferry over the Baltimore and Ohio Railway. Owing to the delay of my train,

caused by heavy snows in the Alleghenies, I did not reach Harper's Ferry until afternoon on Wednesday. Then I took the Winchester, Potomac, and Strasburg road, which ran by Charlestown and Winchester. As I took my seat in the car, I discovered the first evidence of the excited condition of the country. When the conductor came to receive my ticket, he said, "Excuse me, sir, but it is made my duty to ask for the name of every stranger entering the State." I gave him my name and it appeared to be entirely satisfactory. In one part of the car there was a group of ladies and gentlemen talking about John Brown. I soon discovered that among them was Captain Avis, the jailer who had charge of Brown during his imprisonment. I heard him say that Brown had spoken of the kindness with which Captain Avis had treated him as a reason why he would not attempt to escape from jail.

It was near sunset when I reached Winchester. I went directly to the Taylor House, having been told that that was the best hotel in the town. As I entered the clerk's office, I was reminded that I must register my name and address. As several rough and rather *spirituous* looking persons were standing about, it occurred to me, that the word Oberlin written upon

the page of the register, for the inspection of such people, might produce a degree of excitement unfavorable to my object in visiting the place. Calling to mind the name of the township in which Oberlin was situated, I went promptly to the clerk's desk, the men dividing to enable me to do so, and wrote in a good bold hand, "James Monroe, Russia." I withdrew, and the crowd went up to examine the record. I left them studying upon it. The landlord told me, the next day, that when they asked him who James Monroe of Russia was, he replied that all he knew about it was I was a Russian. I have already spoken of Judge Parker as residing in Winchester; and having ascertained his address, I went at once to his house. I found him, presented my letter of introduction from Mr. Griswold, and was most courteously received. I told him my story—somewhat as I have told it to you—and explained how entirely my errand was one of humanity—of compassion for an afflicted father and mother. Very sincerely, as I believe, he expressed his sympathy with my object, his readiness to help me in it, and his opinion that it could be accomplished. He invited me to take tea with himself and his family, and proposed that, after tea, we should, together, pay a visit to the President

of the Medical College, Dr. McGuire, and if it met his approval, should then send for other members of the Faculty, and have a meeting for consultation in regard to the object of my mission. I of course staid to the evening meal, and the invitation to attend a Faculty Meeting seemed so natural that it made me feel quite at home. I found Mrs. Parker a very agreeable lady, and we had a pleasant social occasion around the family table. After tea, Judge Parker went with me to Dr. McGuire's. On the way I happened to remark that I had sometimes thought that John Brown was not entirely sane. He repudiated this opinion, saying that he had observed Brown closely during the trial, and was convinced that he had a great deal of intelligent malice. The Faculty Meeting was held, and was entirely satisfactory. So far as I could judge, the best feeling existed. It was unanimously agreed that the body of Copeland should be delivered to me to be returned to the home of his parents. The college undertaker was present. He promised that he would work a portion of the night, and that by nine o'clock on the following morning, my sorrowful freight should be decently prepared for delivery at the express office. I was cautioned by one of the professors not to speak of the object of my

visit at the hotel. I could readily assure them that I would not, and, within myself, I thought it much more likely that the news would get out through some one of the families of those who were present than through me. Feeling, however, no concern about the matter, I returned to the public house, and went to bed happy. I thought I saw my way clear to take back the body of the young soldier of liberty to his sorrowing family to be buried in the soil of Oberlin. I might say here, that I had already mentioned, more than once, that I bore upon my person the permission of Governor Wise to visit Virginia for the purpose I had in view, and I had perhaps exhibited his telegram. But this permission could, in any event, have only a moral weight, and that proved to be but small in Winchester, as the Governor did not appear to be popular there. In the morning a colored servant entered my room and built a great pine-wood fire in the old-fashioned fireplace. I thought it remarkable that he at once began telling me of his trials and hardships as a slave. It was evident that he thought me a Northern man, or at least one in sympathy with persons in his condition. I took an early breakfast, and was impatiently waiting for the hour at which I was to meet the undertaker, when a

message was brought that some gentlemen wished to see me. I received them in the parlor of the hotel. They were a committee of students from the college—half a dozen in number—who had come to give me their view of the situation. A tall, lean, red-haired young man from Georgia acted as their chairman. I had seen committees of students before, but this one seemed rather more excited than any which I had previously met. As the chairman addressed me standing, I also stood. I cannot give an accurate, verbatim report of his speech, but I remember the sentiment and the more remarkable turns of expression. He spoke in substance as follows:—

"Sah," said he, "these gentlemen and I have been appointed a committee by the medical students to explain this matter to you. It is evident to us, sah, that you don't understand the facts in the case. Sah, this nigger that you are trying to get don't belong to the Faculty. He isn't theirs to give away. They had no right to promise him to you. He belongs to us students, sah. Me and my chums nearly had to fight to get him. The Richmond medical students came to Charlestown determined to have him. I stood over the grave with a revolver in my hand while my chums dug him

up. Now, sah, after risking our lives in this way, for the Faculty to attempt to take him from us, is mo' 'an we can b'ar. You must see, sah, and the Faculty must see, that if you persist in trying to carry out the arrangement you have made, it will open the do' for all sorts of trouble. We have been told that Governor Wise gave you permission to come into this State and get this nigger. Governor Wise, sah, has nothing to do with the matter. He has no authority over the affairs of our college. We repudiate any interference on his part. Now, sah, that the facts are befo' you, we trust that we can go away with your assurance that you will abandon the enterprise on which you came to our town. Such an assurance is necessary to give quiet to our people."

I replied to the gentleman from Georgia that I was glad to hear from all sides of the question; that the view taken by the students was important, and deserved and should have respectful consideration; but that, as my arrangements had been made with the approval of the Faculty, and I had, as yet, no intimation from them that their view of the matter had, in any way, been changed, I thought the young men would agree with me that the courtesy due between gentlemen required that I should not

abandon my undertaking without consultation with their teachers. I closed, however, by saying that I would cheerfully promise the committee that I would at once give up my plan when advised to do so by their professors. The chairman of the committee would have been glad to have me say, at once, that I would do nothing further; but I adhered to my purpose. The committee then left, without any discourtesy of language or manner, but as I thought with some suppressed feeling.

I went at once to see Professor Smith, who had shown me much sympathy in my object, and who was on the point of coming to me. He said, "The Faculty would still be willing to make an effort to carry out their contract with you, but they suppose it to be impracticable." He then told me what I had not heard before, that during the night the students had broken into the dissecting rooms of the college, had removed the body of Copeland, and hidden it, it was reported, at some place in the country. He added that if, under these circumstances, we were to persist in an effort to recover the body, the whole country about us would soon be in a state of excitement. He thought it the wiser course, therefore, that my object should be given up. I believed he was right, and decided

to act accordingly. The result was a great disappointment to me; but it seemed to be inevitable.

In thus recording my decision to abandon further effort, it is a satisfaction to add that time has made it more and more evident that Copeland was abundantly worthy of all the interest which we took in his case. Recently the Virginia officials who were connected with his trial, conviction and execution, have been publishing the favorable impression he made upon them. Mr. Andrew Hunter, who was the State prosecutor at the trial, in communications given to the press a few years since, says: "Copeland was the cleverest of all the prisoners. He had been educated at Oberlin. He was the son of a free negro, and behaved better than any man among them. If I had had the power and could have concluded to pardon any, he was the man I would have picked out. * * * He behaved with as much firmness as any of them, and with far more dignity." Judge Parker, in an interview published in the St. Louis "Globe Democrat" in 1888, says: "Copeland was the prisoner who impressed me best. He was a free negro. He had been educated, and there was a dignity about him that I could not help liking. He was always manly."

I was now ready to set my face towards home; but there was no train from Winchester back to Harper's Ferry until the following morning. By taking a carriage, however, in the afternoon, across the country to Martinsburg, I could catch the evening train on the Baltimore and Ohio road for Wheeling. My arrangements were made, therefore, to do this. Professor Smith advised me not to go to a hotel when I should reach Martinsburg. A general military review of all the soldiers who were present at John Brown's execution, and others also, was in progress that day in Martinsburg, and there would be many violent and half-drunken men about the public houses, whom it would be well for me to avoid. He offered to give me a letter of introduction to 'Squire Conrad, a friend of his, a lawyer of high character and standing in that town, and told me to drive directly to his house, and remain there until the hour for the train. This letter I thankfully accepted. As I had still two or three hours to wait for dinner, a young member of the Faculty — I think an associate professor — took me to the college and showed me its various apartments and appliances for instruction. We visited the dissecting rooms. The body of Copeland was not there, but I was startled to

find the body of another Oberlin neighbor whom I had often met upon our streets, a colored man named Shields Greene. I had indeed known that he also had been executed at Charlestown, as one of John Brown's associates, but my warm interest in another object had banished the thought of him from my mind. It was a sad sight. I was sorry I had come to the building; and yet who was I, that I should be spared a view of what my fellow-creatures had to suffer? A fine, athletic figure, he was lying on his back—the unclosed, wistful eyes staring wildly upward, as if seeking, in a better world, for some solution of the dark problems of horror and oppression so hard to be explained in this.

After dinner and after the payment of bills, including one of considerable amount from the undertaker, who had made progress, to a certain extent, with his preparations, I was furnished by my landlord with a comfortable carriage and a colored driver, to take me to Martinsburg. The drive of perhaps twenty miles was spirited and enjoyable. It was a fine, clear December day. The sunshine was golden; there was no snow upon the ground, and the temperature was mild. The country, agreeably undulating, diversified with hill and valley, woodland and meadow, and watered by spring-fed streams,

well deserved the epithet of "beautiful," bestowed upon it by John Brown when on his way to the scaffold on a like golden day of the same December. This region was a part of that beautiful valley of the Shenandoah—the valley of Virginia we called it during the war—which so fearfully expiated its share in the crime of slavery, by the desolation which the constant march of successive armies, Union and Confederate, left upon its fields. The soldiers of Sheridan, Banks, and Milroy, on the one side, and those of Joseph E. Johnston, Stonewall Jackson, and Early, on the other, advanced or retreated over these lands. An intelligent observer once said to me, "There wasn't a fence rail left in the valley of Virginia after the war." General Sheridan, having laid it waste, as a military necessity, wrote to Washington that "a crow could not find rations" where he had been. Judge Parker, in a paper already quoted, says:—"I have no doubt it is true that Winchester changed hands, as is claimed, more than eighty times, during the war. These were real occupations, not merely the entrance and exit of scouting parties." Along the same road over which I was now passing, General Banks, two or three years later, marched from Winchester to Martinsburg with a portion

of the fifth corps of the army of the Potomac. It was for a decision reached by him during this march, that he was charged with violating the Constitution of the United States. It was early in the war, and many people in the North were still sensitive about fine constitutional points. A slave woman came from one of the farms along his route, and climbed upon one of his gun carriages, intending to ride out of the country with "Massa Linkum's army." What was the offense which General Banks committed? He let her ride. Until a few weeks since, I had been in doubt as to what became of the Winchester Medical College during the war. Recently, I wrote to the postmaster of that town, making inquiry upon the subject. In reply, I received a letter from Dr. Conrad, a gentleman of high standing in Winchester, which I here quote, and which will explain itself:—

WINCHESTER, VA., Sept. 7, 1894.

JAMES MONROE,

DEAR SIR:—The postmaster asked me, as the oldest living graduate of the old Winchester Medical College, to answer your note. The college was burnt by General Banks' army in May, 1862. He himself regretted it, but his New England doctors and chaplains did it—applied the torch with their own hands. They proclaimed that theirs was a campaign of education. In this manner did that thorough old school of medicine become obliterated. The ground, belonging to the State, was sold, and is now

built upon. Only one of the professors now lives—Dr. Hunter McGuire, of Richmond.

I am, sir, respectfully yours, D. B. CONRAD.

I should have been glad to have had a further account of this matter from our own soldiers; but General Banks had just died when I received this note, and I knew not to whom else to write. I think it probable that the building had been used by both sides for military purposes, and this would have justified either the Union or Confederate forces in destroying it. Towards sunset, as I approached Martinsburg, I began to meet successive squads of soldiers—some on horseback, and some in wagons—returning to their homes from the review. As he saw them coming, my colored driver would turn well out upon the side of the road, and stop his horses until they had passed. They were full of Virginia patriotism, and some of them of something else. I put my head out of the carriage, and gazed at them with all the innocent curiosity I could express. They inspected me narrowly. It would have been very natural, in such a time of suspicion and scrutiny, if they had asked my name and residence, and business in the State. This might have been embarrassing, and I was thankful when I had run the gauntlet unquestioned. Having entered

Martinsburg, I went, as advised, to the house of 'Squire Conrad, where the letter of Professor Smith procured me a friendly reception. Mr. Conrad introduced me to his daughter—an amiable and intelligent young lady—and to Captain Conrad, his son—a genial, ingenuous, and manly fellow—who had commanded a company at Brown's execution. I was happy, on invitation, to take my evening meal of tea and toast in this kindly social atmosphere. There was, I think, no other member of the family living, except a son who was pursuing a course of study at the Episcopal Theological Seminary at Alexandria. 'Squire Conrad, though a slaveholder, was a decided Union man; but when Virginia voted in favor of secession, the whole family, regretfully, but almost unavoidably, were drawn into the movement. I explained to him the object of my visit to the State, of which he appeared to approve; and he cordially offered me the hospitality of his house until I should wish to take a train for the North. During our conversation, he spoke of the mild character of slavery in his neighborhood, saying, that he had never known but one master who had neglected to provide for his slaves when old, and he had lost standing with his class. During the contest at Harper's

Ferry, Colonel Washington, a descendant of a brother of George Washington, and several other citizens, had been held as prisoners for a time, by John Brown, in the arsenal. Referring to some question which had been raised as to whether Colonel Washington had behaved with proper courage, Mr. Conrad said he did not think the courage of any man bearing the name of Washington could be questioned, but he did wonder how Colonel Washington could have continued to exist thirty hours without whiskey. After tea he excused himself to attend some meeting of his church, saying, he would leave me in charge of his son and daughter; and very pleasant young people they were to be left in charge of, as I can certify. I shall never forget the kindness of this family, which, shown to me under these peculiar circumstances, was doubly grateful. We learned that the train would not arrive until ten o'clock, and I suggested to Captain Conrad that as he might have other engagements, and as I could find my way to the train without difficulty, alone, it was not necessary that he should give me the whole evening. He replied that his time was quite at my service; and there was so much excitement among their people, that he thought it better I should not be

without the presence of some gentleman who could vouch for me. We had a long talk that evening about John Brown, Governor Wise, and the growing discord between North and South. He thought it unnecessary and impolitic that the authorities should have made such a military display at the time of the execution, and laughed at the stories of abolitionists coming over the mountains to rescue Brown. He paid a striking tribute to the courage of the great fighter for freedom. The incident is a painful one, but it is instructive. An acquaintance of his who stood behind Brown on the scaffold, and who, in the discharge of official duty, had had much of that sad kind of experience, told him that, generally, however firm a condemned man might, in the main, appear, yet as his hands lay bound, one upon the other, behind his back, there was certain to be some nervous movement of the fingers, as the fatal moment drew near; but that, in the case of Brown, the fingers lay as quiet as those of a sleeping child. As the hour of ten approached, Captain Conrad accompanied me to the station, and when the train arrived, to guard against the possible effects of a hostile telegram which might be sent to some town up the road by an evil-disposed person, he went on board the sleeper with me,

introduced me to the conductor as a man entitled to courteous treatment, and commended me to his protection. He then bade me good-by. That I was protected I am certain, for, after a good night's sleep, I awoke, safe and sound, the next morning, in the city of Wheeling.

This is perhaps a suitable point to add whatever I have been able to learn of the subsequent history of the Conrad family. When the war broke out both of the sons entered the Confederate army. It must have been before the close of the year 1861, that, in some paper, I accidentally came upon a paragraph, which I suppose had been copied originally from the Virginia press, to the effect that two sons of 'Squire Conrad, of Winchester, officers in the Confederate service, had both been killed in the first Battle of Bull Run; that their bodies had been recovered, had been brought home to Winchester, and buried by moonlight.

Having crossed the Ohio River at Wheeling, and experienced the satisfaction of once more setting my feet upon free soil, I took the cars for Wellsville. Being compelled to wait there an hour or two for a train to Cleveland, I sent two telegrams to Oberlin—one to

my family and another to the mayor of the town. I had lost all knowledge of both of these dispatches until Mr. Copeland kindly furnished me with an old copy of the Cleveland "Leader" of December 28, 1859, which contains the telegram to the mayor. It reads as follows:—

WELLSVILLE, OHIO, Dec. 23, 1859.

TO MAYOR BEECHER:

Obtained consent of the Faculty of Winchester Medical College to take the body. Arrangements nearly completed. Was prevented by the students.

J. MONROE.

This telegram, I afterwards learned, afforded my friends considerable relief; as they had heard nothing of me from Monday until Friday of that week. The next day, Saturday, December 24, I reached home, and on the afternoon of Sunday, the day following—Christmas Day—there was a mass meeting in the First Church, at which I was required to give a full account of my failure. I speak of the effort as a failure. In one sense it was a failure, but in another sense it was not. As a community and as individuals, we had done what we could, according to our sense of duty; and this is always success. At first I dreaded to meet the parents; but when I did meet them, I experienced unexpected relief. They had found much

comfort in the fact that, by the kind providence of God, every reasonable effort had been made in their own behalf, and in behalf of the memory of their son. They were grateful to God and grateful to their neighbors. Their satisfaction was increased by the accounts which came in of the manly bearing of their boy in the time of the terrible ordeal; and they were finally enabled to say with the great apostle, "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us."

SPECIAL DUTIES OF CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES DURING THE CIVIL WAR.

A THURSDAY LECTURE.

In the autumn of 1862, I was appointed by President Lincoln, Consul of the United States for the port of Rio de Janeiro. Owing to delays which I need not explain here, I did not reach that city and enter upon the discharge of my official duties until early in the following March. Some experiences acquired in connection with this responsible trust, will furnish the subject of the present paper.

I shall not describe the political or social or religious life of Brazil, although each of these subjects, especially in the light of recent events, is not without its attractions. I shall not dwell upon the ordinary duties of an American Consul in that country, which are very similar to his duties elsewhere, and are doubtless familiar to most intelligent readers. I shall speak only of certain special duties which were imposed

upon me by the Civil War. In giving an account of this portion of my work, I shall doubtless also be describing work substantially the same done by my colleagues at other great commercial centers. These special duties of American Consuls during the war have not, I think, been much written about, and they may be worth recording as belonging to a class which our Consuls had never had to perform before, and which, we may hope, they may never have to perform again.

During the early part of my stay in Brazil, one or more of the rebel cruisers—the Alabama, the Florida, the Shenandoah, and others—were lying in wait near the coast of that country, or on the highways that lead to its principal commercial ports, to seize and destroy any American merchant vessels that might come in their way. This work of destruction was barbarous, cowardly, and ruinous to our commerce, and was made all the more irritating by the fact that it received substantial aid from England. Of course, our vessels of war were on that coast exerting themselves to the utmost to find and destroy these steamers. But the policy of the latter was to avoid fighting—to burn or sink as many defenseless vessels as possible, but to run away from every vessel that was

armed—to inflict the greatest possible injury with the least possible risk. With this policy in view, the rebel vessels had been built for fast sailing rather than for strength. It became one of my first duties, on reaching my consulate, to use the utmost vigilance in collecting the latest information in regard to the whereabouts of the cruisers and conveying this in the promptest manner to the commanders of all men-of-war within my reach. They, of course, lost no time in going in pursuit. We continued this kind of work for a long period, and in one respect it did great good. The activity of our war steamers, the kind of omnipresence which they exhibited on the highways of trade, and the hot chase which they sometimes gave the eneemy, did much to scare away the cruisers and to keep the roads of commerce open. But, as regards capturing and destroying the rebel vessels, not much was accomplished. Whenever one of our frigates reached the point where a rebel was last heard from, she was not there. Our officers had the greatest desire to meet them, but the feeling was not reciprocated. I thought it something of a compliment that no Confederate steamer came into the harbor of Rio de Janeiro during my residence in Brazil; but this was doubtless due to the great publicity

which must attend the arrival of such a steamer at the political and commercial capital of the empire. On the high seas, our war vessels could seldom find those of the rebels; if they came upon them in the harbor of a friendly power, they could not touch them; and if they waited for them outside, they would not come out.

In this connection, one incident occurred which produced great excitement, and became historical. In the latter part of September, 1864, the United States war steamer Wachusett, in charge of Commander Collins, a faithful and efficient officer, was lying in the harbor of Rio de Janeiro. He had come into port to take in coal and get news of the Confederates. While the Wachusett was still in the harbor, a dispatch came to us from Bahia, a city seven or eight hundred miles north of Rio de Janeiro, that the rebel cruiser Florida was expected to come to that port to obtain supplies. Commander Collins at once decided to go to Bahia. The afternoon before he sailed, he had a conference in my private office with the American minister and myself. He said, apparently in the way of criticism, that his young officers wished him to take the Florida wherever he could find her. I remember that he did not express any

positive opinion of his own, but seemed to be restless and unsettled. Of course we could only say to him, what he must have known already, that if he were to touch the Florida in the harbor of Bahia, it would be an insult to a friendly power and a gross violation of international law. Soon after he reached that port, the Florida also entered, and the two vessels lay there together two or three days. The cruiser was fresh from the destruction of defenseless American merchantmen, and her officers and sailors now walked the streets of Bahia, or rowed their boats about the harbor, before the very eyes of Commander Collins, with a sense of perfect security under the shelter of the Brazilian flag. The situation was very exasperating, and was the more provocative of an act of violence because Commander Collins believed, and seems to have had some evidence for the belief, that Brazilian authorities, during the previous year, had permitted the Alabama to burn three American vessels within three miles of the shore. Captain Morris, of the Florida, a portion of his officers, and half of his crew, passed the night of the 7th of October on shore. The people of the Wachusett were all on board. About three o'clock in the morning, Commander Collins, after a brief conference with his officers,

"bore down upon the Florida under a full head of steam." After a brief contest, which was carried on, in part, by an unsuccessful attempt at ramming by the Wachusett, and, in part, by an irregular discharge of small arms and cannon, the officer in charge of the Florida surrendered her. Commander Collins ordered a cable made fast to the Florida, and amid the ineffective fire of Brazilian ships and forts towed her out of the harbor upon the high seas. Two Brazilian ships pursued, as soon as practicable, but soon lost sight of the Wachusett and her prize, and returned. A leading journal at Rio de Janeiro spoke of the soldiers who fired upon the Wachusett from the forts as exhibiting "incredible valor." When it is remembered that Commander Collins was fleeing from the harbor with all the speed he could command, and that every consideration of prudence, honor, and obligation forbade his returning the fire, the remark seems ludicrous enough.

A colleague of mine who had been a useful and well-meaning consul at Bahia, allowed his enthusiasm for the flag so far to get the better of his discretion, as to lead him unduly to enlarge the list of duties which he thought had been made incumbent upon him by the war. He urged Commander Collins to make the

capture and assisted him in it. As a result he found it prudent to be on board the Wachusett when she left the country. He had at least the satisfaction of being out of the reach of an angry mob which a few hours later attacked his consulate, and defaced the American coat of arms.

The Brazilians were everywhere greatly excited over this act of unfriendly violence; and it was only by the prompt and earnest assurances of General Webb, the spirited and patriotic American minister, which were at once published in the papers, that the United States would promptly make the fullest reparation, that hostile feeling was allayed.

The next morning after the news of what had happened in Bahia reached Rio de Janeiro, I found, at the foot of the staircase leading up to my consulate, a small company of soldiers. On entering my office, I was told by my assistants that these soldiers had been sent by the Chief of Police to protect the consulate in case there should be any danger of insult to the United States flag or coat of arms from excited men on the street. If these soldiers had no opportunity to defend the consulate, they at least had a chance to obtain a little pocket money. I sent them a milreis—about half a dollar—

apiece, with my compliments, and excused them from further attendance. Thus, so far as I was concerned, peace was made with Brazil.

Commander Collins, without accident or interruption, towed the Florida to Hampton Roads on our own coast. Brazil at once made bitter complaint in regard to this act of hostility to a friendly power. Mr. Seward in behalf of his Government promised the fullest reparation. Commander Collins would be suspended from rank and pay, and ordered to appear before a court-martial. The consul at Bahia would be dismissed from the service. Order would be taken that an American ship of war should proceed to the harbor of Bahia, and there salute the Brazilian flag in atonement for the outrage upon it. There was another point which would have been the most difficult of all. In making reparation, international law would have required that the Florida should have been returned to the very place from which she was taken in the harbor of Bahia. This was an act which would have been unpleasant for Brazil to have demanded, and humiliating for the United States to have performed. It might long have retarded an amicable adjustment. But about a fortnight after coming to anchor in Hampton Roads, the Florida sprung a leak and went to

the bottom. The disposition to be made of the cruiser was thus removed from the controversy. I know of no accident in our history which was more timely or useful. The promises of Mr. Seward were faithfully kept. The only fault which I ever heard found with our Government was that after the expiration of the brief period of suspension—which, I think, was only six months—pronounced upon him by the court-martial, the promotion of Commander Collins was very rapid. In 1866, he was advanced to the rank of captain, and as early as 1874 was made a rear-admiral. The proposed act of courtesy and reparation in the harbor of Bahia was considerably delayed on account of the missending of a dispatch, but was at length faithfully performed. One of our war steamers, the Nipsic, commanded by Captain Blake, entered that port July 21, 1866. An arrangement for the ceremonial was made with the proper authorities. At high noon, on the 23d, the Brazilian flag was displayed at the foremast head of the Nipsic, and a salute of twenty-one guns was then fired in its honor, from the decks of that frigate. Its guns boomed and thundered and roared, amid the acclamations of the Brazilian multitudes on shore, until the wounded honor of Brazil was healed,

and the old cordiality between the two nations was restored.

I might have mentioned, in the proper connection, that it was made my duty by the Government to communicate all intelligence which I might receive of the locality and the ravages of rebel cruisers not only to commanders of American vessels of war, but also to the Department of State at Washington. This duty I, of course, continued to perform, and in so doing was enabled, on one occasion, to render to the Government a service of some importance. In October, 1864, a new Confederate steamer made her appearance near the equator, northeast of Brazil, and commenced the work of destruction. She was called the Shenandoah, was English-built, and commanded by Captain Waddell. Our consuls felt as much interest in watching for new rebel steamers as astronomers do in watching for new comets, and the question of priority of discovery sometimes excited attention. Within a few weeks this cruiser captured and burnt or sunk four American vessels, and captured and bonded a fifth. The captains and portions of the crews of two of these vessels, after having been taken on board the Shenandoah as prisoners, were placed by arrangement on board a Danish brig, the Anna Jans, which

happened to make a quick passage to Rio de Janeiro. With the aid of statements from these captains, who were intelligent and observing men, I was enabled to send to Mr. Seward, under date of November 29, 1864, the first definite and somewhat complete account of the Shenandoah and her ravages. My dispatch was forwarded by Mr. Seward to Mr. Adams in London, was by him laid before Earl Russell, as the basis of a claim upon the British government for damages, and, I trust, added something to the moral weight of that appeal for justice which the United States made to the tribunal at Geneva.

Another consular duty imposed upon me by the Civil War, and especially by the presence of rebel cruisers on the coast of Brazil, was to receive and provide for the seamen from our sunk or burnt merchant vessels, who had been made prisoners by the Confederates, and afterwards sent on shore, generally in a destitute condition. Large numbers found their way, directly or indirectly, to Rio de Janeiro. They had often been inhumanly treated, and for the most part, everything which they possessed of any value had been taken from them. They were sometimes sent adrift with nothing except what decency absolutely demanded—a single shirt

and a pair of trousers. It became my duty to take charge of these forlorn and disheartened people—to feed and clothe them—to secure hospital accommodations for the exhausted and the sick, and to arrange for their return to the United States, either by reshipping them or by placing them as passengers on homeward bound vessels. All this required a considerable expenditure of money, which must be made with careful economy and accompanied with a strict system of accounts. It was often a painful thing to meet companies of my fellow-countrymen almost literally stripped of all they had in the world; but I had no pleasanter duty to perform, while in Brazil, than to supply their wants. In doing this work, I was only continuing what had been well begun by my predecessor, a gallant and capable officer, the Honorable R. C. Parsons, of Cleveland.

This brings me to notice another of my duties which grew out of the war—a duty which came, not in the form of service to destitute victims of rebels, but of service to destitute rebels themselves. When the armies of the Confederacy were vanquished, and the Union of the States was restored, many Southern men found themselves so uncomfortable in what they were pleased to regard as a condition of

subjugation, that they resolved to migrate from under the flag and out of the country that they had come to hate. Their attention was at once turned to Brazil as their future home. This seems to have been due, in part, to the fact that its staple products were to some extent the same as those of their own section, and, in part, to the fact that Brazil was still a slaveholding nation. Disappointed, soured, humiliated, they would flee from a republic where they had been beaten in a desperate struggle for power, and where many hundreds of millions of property had been taken from them in the forced emancipation of their slaves, and would find refuge under the flag of an empire where sugar and rice and cotton could still be raised from the soil, and where they could still maintain an aristocratic position and their title to the name of gentlemen by continuing in the relation of slaveholders. In 1865 and 1866, large numbers of these men, often with their families, having turned all that they had left into gold, emigrated to Brazil; and of these some hundreds came to the city of Rio de Janeiro. I was told that, when they arrived, they were sometimes asked if they would not visit the American Consul, but that the reply was that they had no wish to see "Abe

Lincoln's hireling." President Lincoln had then been some months dead, but the old phrase still answered their purpose. At that time, however, they did not seem to be in much need of aid from the Consul. They were received with much friendly attention, and even with distinction, by Brazilian officials both at the Capital and in the interior, and every assistance was rendered them in the choice of their new homes. They bought or leased lands, bought or hired slaves, and once more had all the dignity of planters. For a time, everything appeared to go well; but in less than a year, that failure—that financial ruin—which had always been inevitable, had already overtaken a portion of them, and soon involved nearly all. The causes were not far to seek. First of all, they did not understand farming in Brazil, and they did not find it easy to acquire a knowledge of it. Many of the slaves whom they had bought, or for whose services they had contracted, ran away, and it was not easy to recover them. There were laws in Brazil for the return of escaped slaves, but it was difficult to find the slaves. The fugitives secured places of refuge among their fellow-slaves, upon plantations far and near, and the Brazilian planters themselves were thought to be unsympathetic and unhelpful in

the work of rendition. It added to the inconvenience of the situation that most of our Southern friends could not speak or understand the Portuguese language. Many of them soon found that they had not money enough left to support themselves and their families until they could gather and market their first crop, and, in some cases, there did not seem likely to be any first crop. The outcome of all this was a strong reaction in the minds of the emigrants in favor of returning to their native land. The advanced guard of the retreating force soon made its appearance in Rio de Janeiro, and other detachments followed at intervals. This time they had no prejudices which prevented their visiting the American Consul, and I found them as affable and gracious as I could desire. Many of them were very estimable people. They frankly avowed their willingness to be indebted to the United States or to private individuals for present support and conveyance to some one of our ports. In anticipation of this, I had solicited subscriptions from Americans in Rio de Janerio to replenish the treasury of an organization known as the "American Benevolent Society," which had sometimes aided citizens of the United States in reduced condition, and from which some temporary relief might

be afforded to these returning Confederates. But all that could be obtained from this source was quite inadequate to their needs. They must somehow have help on a larger scale. Not only must their board be paid, for a time, in Rio de Janeiro, but provision must be promptly made for their return to their homes, in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi.

I wrote to Secretary Seward describing the situation of these sufferers and begging that the Government, in spite of its enormous debt and its great current expenditure, would adopt some plan to convey them to the United States. I never knew Mr. Seward to neglect an appeal in behalf of American citizens. He always did something, and I used to think that what he did was always the best thing. By return of steamer, I received a dispatch from him, in reply to mine, enclosing another from Mr. Welles, the Secretary of the Navy. The dispatch from Mr. Welles was addressed to the commanders of all homeward-bound American vessels of war, ordering them to take on board as many of the destitute Southerners as they could accommodate and convey them to the United States at the expense of the Government. Mr. Seward wrote me, making it my duty, whenever one of our war vessels should enter the harbor,

to go on board and read or exhibit to her commanding officer both the dispatch of Mr. Seward and that of Mr. Welles. The speedy arrival at Rio de Janeiro of the United States war steamer Guerriere—then one of the finest vessels in our navy—gave me, I think, my first opportunity to perform this new service. The Guerriere was the flag-ship of Admiral Davis, then in command of the South Atlantic Squadron, and her captain was F. M. Ramsey, who, after many years of honorable service, is now, with the rank of commodore,* chief of the Bureau of Navigation in Washington. I went promptly on Board the Guerriere, paid my respects to the admiral, and exhibited the order from the Government. He seemed much disturbed. He said the proposed plan was impracticable. The Secretaries could not have realized what they were doing. Should the Guerriere take her quota of these unfortunates, her main deck must be covered with houses for their accommodation. This would leave no room to work the guns or handle the men. The ship would become a scene of confusion and disorder. And suppose her commander should have to fight a naval battle on the way home? What could the Guerriere do under such disabilities

* Recently promoted to the rank of admiral.

and with such a crowd of non-combatants on board? To be sure we had no present prospect of war; but who could tell what the future would develop? A ship of war was made to fight, and she ought always to be ready to do it. It was not my duty to argue these questions with the admiral. I listened respectfully, and only replied, that I, of course, had no authority in the case, having acted merely as the messenger of Mr. Seward. I then took my leave, Now Admiral Davis was an accomplished and efficient officer and an excellent man. He did gallant service during the war. He was a man of large scientific attainments and a cultivated gentlemen. He was the author of several valuable works; was the founder of the American Nautical Almanac; had been connected with the Coast Survey; and had been Superintendent of the National Observatory at Washington. There were many things that he could do; but, that day, he did not think he could place a company of Southern emigrants upon the Guerriere. He was a strict disciplinarian, and a precise, neat, methodical naval officer; and he thought it would put the commander out beyond endurance to turn his magnificent vessel of war into an emigrant-ship. He was a kind-hearted man, and was not wanting in

liberality of feeling toward defeated Confederates. His objections were purely professional, and were not unnatural. It must have been the next day that he came to the consulate. I saw in a moment that he had changed his plan. He began by making inquiries as to the number of the emigrants, how far they were in families or otherwise, and other matters; and in a few moments we were engaged in friendly and animated conversation as to the best method of making the necessary preparation for sending a considerable number of them home upon the flag-ship. This good work was duly accomplished. I believe houses were built upon the main deck for their accommodation. And the commander of the Guerriere did take home with him on that ship fifty-five of their number. There was no naval battle fought on the way home, and I have reason to believe that, what with the pleasure of the common sailors at the new and interesting experience, the judicious management of Captain Ramsey, the officer in command, the kindness of the officers generally to the destitute emigrants, and the warm gratitude of those emigrants to all concerned, there was universal good feeling on board the ship. Subsequently I was enabled to send home companies upon other war steamers.

Some found their way home upon merchant vessels. And thus at length nearly all of the emigrants in Rio de Janeiro and its neighborhood had been conveyed to the United States, except a few who had found professional or other employment in Brazil. So popular did the service which I thus rendered make me in the South that when I came home, and went to Congress, I received a petition from a large Southern town in a neighborhood from which many of the emigrants had gone to Brazil, urging me to get one of their number appointed to a lucrative office!

Another duty growing out of the war which came over to me from my predecessor, was the management of a law-suit. I have no papers with me to refresh my memory, but believe that I have correctly in mind the principal facts of this case. When the war broke out, three American merchant vessels from Richmond, Virginia, were lying in the harbor of Rio de Janeiro. The owners, wishing to escape from the jurisdiction of the United States, made a nominal sale of the vessels to an English house in the last-named city. Upon this sale as a basis, they undertook to effect a change of flag from the United States to England. Some authorities of the place gave their sanction to the

change. Mr. Seward authorized the minister and consul of our government at Rio de Janeiro to contest the legality of this proceeding before the Brazilian courts. The litigation continued for several years. We soon had a decision against us, but, for myself, I must confess that I did the best that I could through able counsel to cause delay, by "appeals," "bills of exception," "new trials," "revisions," and whatever other forms of obstruction the courts of Brazil permitted. At length a decision of the highest court was given against the United States. It was decided that the change of flag was a legal transaction. I could do nothing more. The English house now put one of the vessels in repair that it might be sent to sea upon a commercial venture. But when, on a pleasant afternoon, a steam tug towed it out of the harbor, Captain Glisson, commanding a United States war steamer, I think the Mohican, sailed out at the same time, presumably to try his machinery. The captain of the merchantman observing this, kept well within the marine league, and, hugging the shore, set his face towards Cape Frio. As night came on, finding that he was still accompanied by Captain Glisson, he ordered the tug to turn back in the growing darkness, and thus returned to the harbor.

And there Captain Glisson found him, lying peacefully at anchor, when he also returned on the following morning. After this, the three vessels remained quietly in the harbor until the end of the war.

I will ask your attention to but one more of the duties imposed upon me, while abroad, by the Civil War, and that the saddest which I had to perform. The French packet which reached Rio de Janeiro on the 18th of May, 1865, brought the startling intelligence of the attempted assassination of President Lincoln and Secretary Seward. It appeared that Mr. Lincoln had died, or was about to die, from a wound which he had received; and that Mr. Seward, when already in a feeble condition from a previous accident, had been frightfully injured, but that there was some hope of his recovery. I cannot describe the grief and consternation that filled the hearts of all our little company of loyal Americans at the news of these monstrous crimes. Our compatriots in the United States were profoundly affected by this terrible tragedy; but to understand how we felt in Brazil the reader must remember that we were thousands of miles from home—that we were few in number and surrounded, for the most part, by unsympathetic people—that we had long watched

with intense interest every turn in the fortunes of the patriotic cause in our own country, and that we were all half homesick. This blow was all the heavier that it fell upon us in the very midst of our rejoicing over the capture of Richmond and the surrender of Lee. We had spoken to each other of the noble satisfaction which President Lincoln, Secretary Seward, and their associates must feel at having, under the good hand of God, brought our beloved country through all her troubles to so grand a triumph. Then came the sad intelligence which turned our joy into mourning. We were in doubt how far the death of our two great leaders might not undo much of what had been accomplished. We did not see how the country could afford, at so grave and delicate a crisis, to lose the patient fidelity, the generosity, and the strong good sense of Mr. Lincoln, or the sagacity, the firmness, and the wise moderation of Mr. Seward. Our strong men wept, and every one felt that he had experienced a great personal calamity. It became my duty to prepare a dispatch for the Department of State, expressing, as well as I could, these feelings and opinions of loyal Americans in Rio de Janeiro. As the Secretary of State had been so seriously injured that he might not then be alive, and as his son, the

Assistant Secretary, had been severely wounded at the time of the assault upon his father, my dispatch was addressed to Mr. Hunter, the Chief Clerk, the next officer in rank, whose long and faithful service had made him a kind of Under Secretary of the English type. In writing to him, I expressed my gratification that in such a time of confusion and peril, the Department had an officer of so much experience, ability, and knowledge of its affairs. The dispatch bore the date of May 22, 1865. As there was then no steam line between Brazil and the United States, about three months elapsed before I received a reply. When it came, it was a relief to find that it had been dictated by Mr. Seward, and signed by his own hand. It was dated July 10, 1865, and exhibited that unpretentious simplicity and thoughtfulness for others which were a part of his character. He had been an early anti-slavery man, and always a friend of liberty, of the Constitution, and the Union. He had done great things, and borne many things for these causes. But he was not a man to make much of his labors or his sufferings. It was his way to work on in his appointed task—to fight his battle, if that were necessary. If the people honored him, it was thankfully acknowledged.

If his reputation was assailed, or his life attempted, he could bear it. When a frame that had been mutilated and almost destroyed by the knife of the assassin, had been so far restored that it could be borne to the office of State, he resumed his labors where they had been interrupted. I still have in my possession the original of Mr. Seward's reply to my dispatch, it being one of those original papers which I have found it a satisfaction to preserve. It would seem to have been one of the first dispatches sent out by him after his illness. A portion of this paper I will quote. After some introductory matter, Mr. Seward says:—

"It is a very pleasant duty on my part to express my entire approval of the sentiment you have expressed in regard to the dreadful act of assassination which closed the military struggle of the insurgents, and gave our late lamented President the martyr's crown in exchange for his position as the executive magistrate of a triumphant Republic.

"Moreover, I take special pleasure in expressing my concurrence with you in your estimate of the services of Mr. Hunter, the Chief Clerk, so lately acting as the provisional head of this Department. His extensive knowledge, incorruptible patriotism and honesty, combined

with rare practical ability, make him always a safe reliance for the Government on occasions when his services are demanded.

"For myself, I need not assure you that I am profoundly affected by the feelings of good will and kindness which you have tendered to soothe the memory of some incidents of a painful interest."

In thus describing some of the special duties laid upon me by the Civil War—duties much like those which my colleagues at other ports had to perform—I have, I trust, made it evident that the Consuls of the United States were not without their fair share of the labor and responsibility of the great conflict in which their country was engaged, and that, however far-reaching in their influence were the evils of the war, they were not more far-reaching than the intelligence and energy of President Lincoln and his Secretary of State in providing against them.

WILLIAM H. SEWARD AND THE FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED STATES.

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE FACULTY AND STUDENTS OF OBERLIN COLLEGE, FEBRUARY 22, 1892.

THE policy of Abraham Lincoln in giving cabinet positions to all the Republican candidates for the Presidency who had been opposed to him in the Chicago Convention of 1860, has been much debated. But there can be no question that, in two cases, it proved to be a decided success. Salmon P. Chase was a great financial secretary, and William H. Seward was as nearly an ideal secretary of foreign affairs as men can ever be made. How can I properly characterize this distinguished triumvirate? I can only say that President Lincoln had the most perfect knowledge of the great mass of the people and the most perfect sympathy with them—in other words, the most perfect instinct

for home politics—of any ruler known in history; that Mr. Chase was the only secretary of finance that ever saved his country by means of irredeemable paper money; and that Mr. Seward was the only foreign secretary who ever induced great powers whose aggregate resources were immensely superior to his own, and who would have had the advantage in attacking his country that it had already about all the burden of war it could carry, to remain neutral during several years, at great political and commercial inconvenience to themselves and their people, simply out of respect for his logic. England alone had a fleet which could have destroyed our navy and broken through the lines of President Lincoln's blockade in a single day; but what navy or what army could break the lines of Mr. Seward's arguments, based upon sound principles of international law, the law of nature and of the Author of nature? It is no extravagance of speech to say that for four years Mr. Seward kept all Europe at bay with a syllogism. But you will expect this proposition to be supported by evidence; and this brings me to the announcement of my subject, which is, William H. Seward and the Foreign Affairs of the United States.

Justice has not been done to Mr. Seward.

His consenting, on account of a great mass of unfinished business, to remain in the Cabinet of President Johnson, after nearly all his colleagues had resigned their places, brought upon him severe attacks from the Republican press and politicians. I need hardly add that the hostility of the Democratic party he had incurred already. And so it came to pass that it was, at one time, the fashion for the whole world to cry out against Mr. Seward. This state of feeling perpetuated itself. Later writers copied from earlier, and wrote out with care the current falsehoods which they heard. This unreasoning prejudice has continued, in some degree, to the present time. Further, Mr. Seward's reputation had suffered, in some instances, from what may be called the biographic bias. Even a work, in general, so admirable, both in style and matter, and so indispensable to the future student of history as that of Mr. Nicolay and Mr. Hay, is not exempt from this. It is not that you find in its pages conscious unfairness or important inaccuracy as to facts; but that the authors, by a delicate gift in perspective, cause their hero, whose high merit all admit, to loom largely in the foreground, and retire into the background, with reduced proportions, some of the great men who supported

him. Some English writers and statesmen have expressed the highest appreciation of Mr. Seward's ability and patriotism. But this has not done much to restore his reputation in this country. In view of the wrong thus done to Mr. Seward, it was with some satisfaction that I accepted an invitation to say a word in his behalf to-day. I felt that I might fairly claim to have had some opportunity to form an intelligent and well-founded as well as favorable opinion of his administration of our foreign affairs. I was in the service of the Government under him from March, 1863, until March, 1869. During my term of office it was my duty to read all the printed consular and diplomatic correspondence of the Department of State, which was furnished me for that purpose. I read all circulars addressed to consuls whether confidential or otherwise, and my relations to the United States legation in Brazil were such that I knew, I suppose, much of what was current in diplomatic circles whether official or unofficial. I have felt, therefore, that I was not without some claim to be heard in behalf of Mr. Seward. But while I have prepared this address from the standpoint of opinions long since formed, I have not failed to compare my impressions with those of writers of approved merit for the purpose of

supplementation or correction in any case where the truth of history seemed to require it. And here I desire to acknowledge my indebtedness to Baker's "Works of William H. Seward" and to the life of the great Secretary, by his son, Frederick W. Seward, who was his Assistant Secretary of State, for facts which had not come to my knowledge from other sources, or, if known at the time, had escaped my memory.

In presenting my subject, I will speak, *first*, of the work which Mr. Seward had to do; *next*, of the qualifications which he brought to it; and, *last*, of the degree of success with which he performed it.

I. Of the work which Mr. Seward had to do, the difficult and burdensome portion was that which grew out of the war; and here his first task was to prevent the great powers of Europe from acknowledging the independence of the Confederacy and from furnishing it any form of military aid. That he should accomplish this, would seem to have been indispensable to the success of the Union cause. There were times when the fortunes of North and South hung in so even a scale that recognition or military intervention from Europe would probably have brought the war to a disastrous close. But a glance at the situation when our Civil War

began, will show us that to prevent such intervention was a work of immense difficulty.

Most of the great powers of Europe, especially France and England, had powerful motives for not wishing us well. England soon found the war a serious embarrassment to her manufactures and trade. She contended that President Lincoln's blockade ought not to be considered legal because it was not effective, and at the same time complained that it was sufficiently effective to deprive her, for the most part, of that great staple which was necessary to her cotton manufactures.

In 1860, American cotton was worth, on the docks of Liverpool, £3 per hundred weight; in 1863, it was worth £13 per hundred weight. England at once did what she could to get cotton from other countries, but this was scant in amount and inferior in quality, and soon commanded prices showing an advance corresponding to that in the price of American cotton. Many cotton mills had to be closed, in many others the hours of labor had to be reduced, and thousands of laborers had to be turned out of employment. The loss to England from what was known as the "cotton famine" was estimated at £70,000,000 or $350,000,000. The very life of England, as it is only fair to

remember, depends upon her trade, and hence she has become proverbially sensitive to any injury to her commercial prosperity. She wished the war in the United States to cease as soon as possible; and to that end, if the North could not be conquered by the South, and thus the whole nation be brought under Southern rule and so into sympathy with her commercial theories and plans, which she thought rather improbable, then, as the next best thing, she wished our Government would let the South go and become an independent commonwealth, in which case, Mr. Jefferson Davis' commissioners, who had been unofficially received, assured her she could have free trade with the new nation, could get all the cotton she wanted, and find a great market for her manufactures. Bearing in mind, then, England's great necessities, and the tempting and endlessly varied suggestions of the representatives of the South as to modes of relieving them, we are not to be surprised that she taxed to the utmost the ability of her lawyers and the ingenuity of her statesmen in devising expedients by which the blockade might be broken, or our Government be compelled, in some way, to reopen to England the trade of the country. In keeping with this view, public opinion in England favored her ship builders in

furnishing vessels of war to the South—the theory being that the more help the South had the sooner the North would discover the wisdom of letting her establish an independent government. When, in addition to all this, we remember that England is opinionated, imperious, and accustomed to have her way, we shall see what a task Mr. Seward had upon his hands.

In France, the problem was still more difficult. That country, to a great extent, suffered the same embarrassments to her trade, from our war, that England did; but there was another and deeper cause for dissatisfaction. Napoleon was growing unpopular in his own country, and losing his hold upon power. Oppression, wastefulness, and disregard of solemn pledges, were working their proper results. It occurred to the Emperor that he could dazzle the French people, and regain their favor by some brilliant exploit in the name of the Latin races. He undertook to subvert the republic of Mexico and establish a monarchy in its place with Prince Maximilian of Austria upon the throne. This, besides filling France with cries of "Vive l'Empereur," would doubtless restore good feeling with Austria, which had been impaired by the war in Italy. But Napoleon knew that

the proposed movement in Mexico would seriously offend our Government, as being contrary to the "Monroe doctrine" as well as to all principles of righteous international dealing. Hence he doubtless regarded it as a piece of good fortune that when he wished to inaugurate his new enterprise, the United States were occupied with a war with their own rebellious States. In this contest, his warm sympathies were with the South. He earnestly desired that it might secure national independence, or that, at least, it might be able to protract the war until he could carry out his designs upon Mexico. This disposition on his part was kept in vigorous activity by the shrewdness and tact of the Confederate commissioners, to whom unofficial interviews were accorded. Those who have studied the character of Napoleon will not be surprised to learn that from the time when he discovered that the success of the North would be unfavorable to his interest, he omitted nothing in the way of intrigue, of appeals to the cupidity of different courts, of proposals for joint mediation, joint recognition, and joint intervention, and of implied threats to the United States which he thought likely to promote his end. Mr. Seward had to make an unceasing fight against all this, and had to do it

under the great disadvantage that he thought it his duty constantly to add to the irritation of the Emperor by protesting against his occupation of Mexico. Indeed there was a time when Mr. Seward could probably have secured the absolute neutrality of France, if not some active sympathy with his own Government, by consenting to the robbery of Mexico. But this he could not do. He must save the Union, but must save it along with personal and national honor. When in June, 1864, Maximilian was finally placed upon his tottering throne, Napoleon intimated to Mr. Seward that it would be good policy for him to acknowledge the new Emperor of Mexico, which Mr. Seward refused to do.

Such was the work which Mr. Seward had to do, or at least to attempt, in connection with France. When we think of it as added to that which, we have seen, he had to do in treating with England, we form some idea of the weight of care which rested upon our Secretary of State during our war.

It may be suitable here to present a few facts out of the many which might be quoted, to illustrate and confirm the statements which have been made in regard to the attitude of France and England toward our country and

the efforts of the rebel commissioners. As early as June, 1861, Mr. Seward learned, through our legation at St. Petersburg, that France and England had made an agreement to act jointly in all matters pertaining to the American war, including possible recognition. Russia, who was throughout the steadfast friend of the United States, was invited to join this coalition, but had declined to do so on the ground that our Government had not asked for her good offices. Mr. Seward, writing to Mr. Adams in September, 1862, says:—"Perhaps the most portentous incident that has occurred in the progress of this unhappy strife, was the announcement made to us by the governments of Great Britain and France, that they had agreed to act together in regard to the questions which it should present for their consideration. Every one knows the influence that the united wills of these two great maritime powers carry in the councils of other states." Napoleon, who was the restless member of this league, was constantly making new suggestions to the English ministry in regard to methods of mediation and intervention. In December, 1861, one of our representatives abroad writes from London that Napoleon is demanding of England the breaking of the blockade. A few weeks later we are

told that "the Emperor has renewed his suggestion of interference in our affairs." It was during the darkest days of the war, when our affairs, both at home and abroad, were in their most critical condition, that Napoleon addressed an autograph letter to Mr. Seward, announcing his intention of intervening in the contest with all his strength. In writing to our minister at Paris in October, 1862, Mr. Seward says he has "information that Great Britain and France are seriously considering the question of recognizing the insurgents of this country as a sovereign State." The month following, Mr. Seward writes again to Mr. Dayton that he has learned by telegraph that Napoleon has asked England and Russia to join him "in recommending an armistice in our Civil War." In February, 1863, Napoleon proposed to Mr. Seward through his minister in Washington, that our Government should hold a conference with the rebel commissioners on neutral ground. A few months later, Mr. Seward writes, "We have the personal authority of the Emperor of the French for the fact that he has announced to Great Britain that he is willing to follow, if Great Britain will lead the way, in recognizing the insurgents." In August, 1863, Mr. Seward complains of the Emperor's repeated suggestions of

accommodation with the insurgents. These facts are enough, perhaps more than enough, to illustrate the adverse feeling toward our cause which existed in the two great monarchies of Western Europe and especially in France.

This feeling it was the constant work of the commissioners of the Confederacy to fan into more vigorous life. It was stated by a high authority that the insurgents began their intrigues for foreign intervention before they began their home organization. The Southern commissioners in Europe had ability, shrewdness, tact, plausibility. They were indefatigable, and they were omnipresent. This week they are "poisoning the sources of opinion" in London. The next week they are "redoubling their energy" in Paris. They argue, they plead, they enlighten. They are so candid that they are willing to submit the whole question in dispute upon this continent to the Emperor Napoleon himself. They wish France and England to do what is for their own interest, and are willing to be at some trouble to explain what that interest is. They everywhere promise cotton and free trade and whatever else may be desired. There will be no narrowness, no prejudice, no selfishness about them. It was reported that to conciliate the anti-slavery

people of England and France they offered to emancipate their slaves. On the 4th of May, 1861, they assured Lord Russell that slavery was not a principal cause of the rebellion, but that its real cause was the high prices which the South was obliged to pay for manufactured goods, by way of protecting the Northern manufacturers. They demanded recognition of independence on the ground that they were *de facto* a nation. They said, We have a constitution, a President, a regular administration of justice, an immense territory, eight or nine millions of people, hundreds of thousands of men under arms. Even the United States must, at no distant day, acknowledge our independence. We shall then make such treaties with the nations as we please. What will not then be your regret that you had not, by an earlier avowal of your friendship, gained the first place in our esteem! All these intrigues of the Confederate commissioners had to be watched, exposed, and counteracted by Mr. Seward, and this, of course, greatly added to a burden which already seemed as great as any minister of state could bear.

But Mr. Seward had other duties growing out of the war besides that of preventing European intervention. We have already seen that,

in the interest of national independence upon this continent, he had constantly to protest against, and prevent, if possible, the subversion of a republic and the substitution of a monarchy in its place, in a neighboring state. He had to protest against the building of Confederate vessels in British ports; and the claims of the United States upon England for the destruction of her merchant marine by such vessels, he had to press upon her majesty's government until the very close of the period of his public service. He had to be watchful for the interests of the United States in every part of the globe at a time when those interests were specially exposed to injury on account of the prevalent impression that we were so embarrassed by the war that whatever treatment we might receive we could not resent it. In this connection the correspondence of ministers and consuls furnished him with a multitude of details which claimed his attention. The restoration of the Union did not bring him so much relief as might have been expected. The great contest had started many new questions and disturbed treaty relations with foreign powers. Offense had been given and taken in many cases, and much correspondence had to take place, and many efforts at conciliation and many urgent

demands for justice had to be made before good feeling could be restored with all the parties concerned.

I might add that the work thus far described, which Mr. Seward had to do, was all in addition to the ordinary work of a Secretary of State; and of this he had his full share throughout the whole eight years of his service as foreign minister. Questions of trade, of immigration, of naturalization, of boundaries, of interoceanic canals, of the acquisition of foreign territory and harbors—all demanded prompt and laborious attention.

II. Having thus dwelt as long as time will permit upon the work which Mr. Seward had to do, I proceed to consider next the qualifications which he brought to the performance of it.

I might very justly say, as prefatory to what is to follow, that Mr. Seward was a man of irreproachable character, a thoroughly upright man, and an incorruptible patriot; that he was a firm adherent of the Christian faith, as is evident from his letters to his friends and from his daily life; that he was a sound lawyer and a scholar of wide and thoughtful reading; that he was a clear and accurate thinker, exhibited a fine literary quality in his written efforts, and had a rare judicial candor in investigation; that

some of his most carefully prepared speeches are to this day the best expression of the best thought upon the subjects which they discuss; that he had long experience in public affairs as a leader in New York politics, as a legislator and Governor in that State, and as a member of the United States Senate, in which foreign affairs are, of necessity, much studied and debated. But these qualifications he shared more or less with many of his contemporaries; and they are, in the aggregate, only such as should be taken for granted as being, if not necessary, at least most desirable, as the foundation on which the character of a *great* foreign secretary had to be built up during our Civil War. I pass, therefore, to consider rather certain qualities of Mr. Seward which appear to me to have given him a special fitness for the work he had to do.

1. And here I mention first his great hopefulness. I almost think there never was a minister of state so richly endowed with this quality as Mr. Seward. It was a splendid natural inheritance, which good management had still further increased. No doubt it sometimes led him into extravagant predictions. Early in the war it was the fashion of the newspapers to laugh over what was reported as examples of this. Some of the anecdotes then put in circu-

lation have since been shown to be inventions; as, for instance, the statement attributed to him that the Rebellion would be put down in sixty days. But, making every allowance for the exaggerations of the press and of the story-tellers, the fact remains that he was, I think we may say always, a man of the highest hope. The cause of the country always wore for him a hopeful aspect—always gave promise of success. During the four years of war, he never sent abroad a disheartening dispatch. How could he? Nothing discouraging ever happened in his experience. If there had been a victory, it was to be only the harbinger of more victories. If there had been a defeat, it was an abnormal event, the result of exceptional causes, which no longer existed. His hopefulness had the good quality that it was steadfast. No disappointment in the past abated one jot of his hope for the future. He might have been oversanguine yesterday, but he is not so to day, nor will he be hereafter. You may say that this quality was at least somewhat extravagant in him, that it was an element in his character somewhat out of proportion. My reply is that he needed every particle of it for the work he had to do. If there ever was a man who had a task which demanded hopefulness to the borders of ab-

surdity, that man was William H. Seward. But none of his hopes were absurd, and most of them were justified by the result, especially those larger hopes which had their root in his abiding trust in the goodness and power of God. His hopefulness was, no doubt, a strong element in his character, but it sustained him in labor and in peril, and it carried him triumphantly through.

2. Another quality which specially fitted Mr. Seward for his work as Secretary of State was the peculiar intellectual and moral training which he received when in the United States Senate, and which probably no other senator ever received, at least in the same degree. During the twelve years in which he was a member of that body, he was engaged in an unceasing contest with the representatives of the slaveholding party. He soon discovered that there were three things which he must always be doing: *First*, he must watch for and master the plans which these gentlemen were forming for the strengthening and the extending of the slave power; *second*, he must, with firmness and courage, expose these plans and demonstrate their injustice; and, *third*, he must perfectly command his temper. In all these directions he achieved a marked success. Of

all the men of the North in the Senate, he best understood Southern politics. His reasonings were boldest and went deepest into the heart of things. Other men might speak of the barbarism of slavery, might move their hearers by an account of the cruel murder of a black woman in Georgia. To Mr. Seward such a fact would be as terrible as to any other, but in addressing Senators he chose rather to forewarn them of that "irrepressible conflict" which was going on between two mighty forces, and which must continue until one or the other should be extinguished. Others debated nice points of constitutional law. He did not undervalue such discussions, but he exhorted the Senate and the country not to forget that there was a "higher law," which, like the sky, was above, and shut down over all other laws, and which would surely avenge itself, if violated. His command of temper was wonderful. During all the stormy debates of twelve years, he never uttered an unparliamentary word. He was never called to order; he was never threatened with personal violence; he was never challenged to fight a duel. And yet he was the most feared by the slaveholding class, and, I suspect, the most hated, as he was the most dangerous to their power. Now it so happened that it

was these very qualities in which Mr. Seward had so severe a training in the Senate—the qualities of watchfulness, boldness in reasoning, and good temper—which were specially needed in the conduct of our foreign affairs during the war. This has in part been made apparent already, and it will become still more apparent, when I come to speak of what Mr. Seward actually accomplished.

3. One more qualification which Mr. Seward brought to his work was intense moral feeling. This was both natural and acquired, and it existed in connection with all questions where moral principle was involved. He had especially a deep hatred of slavery and of all injustice. He was an original abolitionist, and he could not have been anything else. His natural aversion to slavery was strengthened by opportunities which he had had of seeing it. In the summer of 1835, when he was still a young man, he made a journey in Virginia with Mrs. Seward by private conveyance. Many scenes connected with slavery which he witnessed, were reported in letters to his friends at home. One of these I will quote as it is reproduced by Frederick W. Seward. It may help us to understand by what influences was formed that unshaken steadiness of purpose against slavery

which characterized him throughout his life. His carriage had arrived at a country inn just at sunset. The writer says, "A cloud of dust was seen slowly coming down the road, from which proceeded a confused noise of moaning, weeping and shouting. Presently, reaching the gate of the stable yard, it disclosed itself. Ten naked little boys between six and twelve years old, tied together, two and two, by their wrists, were all fastened to a long rope, and followed by a tall, gaunt white man who with his long lash whipped up the sad and weary little procession, drove it to the horse-trough to drink, and thence to a shed, where they lay down on the ground, and sobbed and moaned themselves to sleep. These were children gathered up at different plantations by the trader, and were to be driven down to Richmond to be sold at auction and taken South." Here is no vociferation, no violence of language, and yet we can feel the moral temperature of the man rising to a white heat. This intense moral feeling is always necessary to one who would face hostile public opinion, and it was especially needed by Mr. Seward when nearly all the foreign world with which he had to deal was against him. Any one who has attempted the advocacy of an unpopular cause has felt how strong was the

temptation to surrender something of principle, unless he was sustained by sturdy moral convictions. He who moves in a cold atmosphere must be warmed from within. Mr. Seward found little favor for his cause among the great nations with which his Department held intercourse. The unsympathetic diplomatic atmosphere, the cold worldliness of diplomatic dispatches, the tone of polished skepticism which pervades too many of them as to there being any such thing as disinterested zeal for a cause among public men, all this would have disheartened and weakened and finally broken down any secretary of State during our Civil War who had not learned to love truth and righteousness more than the favor of the great. And now became evident the value of Mr. Seward's intense moral feeling. Upheld by strong moral convictions, he maintained a cheerful confidence to the end in the face of all the cavils and threats of unfriendly foreign powers. And as he believed that the war for and against the Union was indirectly a war against and for slavery, his hatred of that institution became one of the strongest elements of that moral intensity which sustained him in his efforts to protect the government against European intervention.

III. But I pass on to inquire with what degree of success Mr. Seward performed the work which was given him to do. This inquiry will be the more interesting from the fact that almost the whole responsibility for success or failure will be Mr. Seward's. When President Lincoln organized his Cabinet, he informed his Secretary of State that the foreign affairs of the country would be left pretty much in his hands. From this policy the President never deviated. Mr. Seward took no important step without first consulting the Chief Executive, but when he did so, President Lincoln almost invariably expressed his approval of the course which the judgment of the secretary favored. Whether therefore we shall find occasion for praise or criticism, each must be alike bestowed upon the minister for foreign affairs.

Of the heavy burden which was imposed upon Mr. Seward by the war, that portion which constituted the great task, which was the vital piece of work, he perfectly accomplished. He did prevent the recognition of the independence of the South by the great powers of Europe, and did restrain them from military intervention in our war. This he effected mainly by the single instrumentality of earnest, persistent, and conclusive reasoning. To be con-

vinced of this, you have only to read his dispatches to Mr. Adams and Mr. Dayton, our representatives at London and Paris, and to our ministers at some other foreign courts in the early part of the war. It is difficult to say which is most complete, his affirmative argument or his argument for refutation. He presents arguments from the reason of the thing —from the inner nature of national organization—from international law—from precedents —from sound policy—from the previous practice of the government to which he writes and the principles upon which it is founded—from considerations, of its future security—from the danger, as a precedent, of interfering with the established order in friendly powers. In letter after letter he invites his correspondents to consider what is lawful, what is just, what is consistent with their past action, and what is safe for their future welfare. He employs the *argumentum ad hominem* and, with England and France, the *argumentum ad reginam* and the *argumentum ad imperatorem*. If Archbishop Whately were alive and were to prepare a new edition of his Logic, he would discover that there is not one worthy form of argument mentioned in his work which could not be abundantly illustrated from the dispatches of Mr.

Seward in pleading the cause of his country. In these varied modes of reasoning, he persisted, day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year. It is of no avail that great ministers tell him that his line of argument is not satisfactory. He only breaks forth afresh. For the hundredth time he demands, why it is not satisfactory, and their work all has to be done over again. He commands his ambassadors to wait upon ministers of state and read his dispatches to them and furnish them with copies. It may probably be said that there is no mode of argument or appeal that could promote his object which he has failed to employ.

Mr. Seward's dispatches to different courts were not mere repetitions of each other. He sent out very few of what are known in diplomacy as "identical notes." The argument addressed to each nation was adapted to its history, character, and circumstances. Many examples of this might be presented, did time permit. I will mention but one or two. So many grave suggestions in regard to American affairs had been made by English officials that it seems almost like a jocose retort, although not so intended, when Mr. Seward called the attention of Lord John Russell to a growing

body of opinion in England, as expressed through public meetings and the liberal press, which was hostile to the policy pursued by the government toward America, and which, acting with other forces, might overthrow the ministry of which his lordship was a member. To both France and England, complaining of the lack of raw material for their cotton industries, Mr. Seward replied: The remedy is simple. Withdraw your recognition of the South as a belligerent, exert your great moral influence on the side of the United States, and in a very short time peace will return, our ports will be opened, and abundant supplies of cotton will re-awaken the hum of your millions of spindles.

It may be mentioned here that the dispatches which Mr. Seward received from our representatives abroad were generally despondent in their tone. It was the result of the perverted public opinion at the courts where they resided. It was Mr. Seward's duty, by assiduous labor, to supply information which should revive hope in the minds of his ministers, and which they could use in disabusing the minds of those to whom they were accredited. It was as a part of this task that he constantly sent out in the dispatches from his office a sort of diary of the principal facts of the war in order that his

correspondents might have a history of events as fair and accurate as, with the means at his command, he could make it. In this way they were protected against the sensational and extravagant reports which reached them from other sources. These diaries probably form to this day the best strictly contemporaneous history of the war which can be found.

For a time Mr. Seward's reasonings with foreign powers did not seem to produce much effect. But at length it became evident that an impression had been made. Repeatedly France and England seemed on the point of breaking the blockade or of acknowledging the independence of the Confederacy. As often as this occurred, Mr. Seward presented some argument, or made some suggestion, or sounded some alarm which averted the catastrophe. They both, but especially France, very much desired to acknowledge the nationality of the South, but they never could quite get ready to do it. One more dispatch always had to be written. I have long thought of Mr. Seward's success in preventing some dangerous form of intervention from the powers of Europe as the greatest triumph of simple and persistent reasoning in political history.

It should be added that Mr. Seward's reason-

ing was strongly supported by certain shrewd but honorable expedients. Two or three examples of this it may not be amiss to mention. And here I follow in several particulars, the authority of Mr. Frederick Seward.

I have already spoken of the predisposition of France and England, from commercial and political reasons, when the war began, not to think well of the national cause. It was due to this predisposition that the Confederate commissioners, through the private opportunities which they enjoyed, gained the ear of the Foreign Office in those countries in advance of us. The social influences in Paris and London were against our country, and the press of those capitals abounded in articles attacking President Lincoln's government. Our ministers were forbidden by the etiquette of their position to write for the newspapers or to engage in private social effort in the interest of the United States. Mr. Seward therefore decided to send abroad three private citizens of experience and ability —unofficial agents—whose duty it should be to send communications to the press, to reply to Confederate attacks, to seek interviews with leading men in business and in the professions, and with members of Parliament and of the French Chambers, and to be instant in season

and out of season to set the American cause right in all intelligent circles. He chose for this purpose Thurlow Weed, a prominent and skillful Republican politician in New York, to meet political leaders; Archbishop Hughes to plead our cause with influential Catholics in Paris; and Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio to visit the prelates of the English Church. These gentlemen proceeded at once to Europe, and a marked change in public opinion was soon observed as the result of their activities there. It became evident that they were admirably fitted for their trust.

In the early summer of 1861, France and England, acting jointly, sent instructions to their two ministers in Washington to wait on Mr. Seward and make to him a joint communication to the effect that those great powers would act together in all matters pertaining to the American war, including the possible recognition of the Confederates. One morning, as Mr. Seward was sitting in his office, a messenger announced that the Ministers of France and England were in the anteroom and wished to see the Secretary together. Mr. Seward had anticipated something of this kind, and he told the messenger to show them into an adjoining room. An account of the interview which

followed I quote from Mr. Frederick Seward, who was probably in the building at the time:—

"A few minutes later, as the two ministers were seated, side by side, on the sofa, the door opened and Seward entered. Smiling and shaking his head, he said: 'No, no, no; this will never do. I cannot see you in that way.' The ministers rose to greet him. 'True,' said one of them, 'it is unusual; but we are obeying our instructions.' 'And at least,' said the other, 'you will allow us to state the object of our visit.' 'No,' said Seward, 'we must start right about it whatever it is. M. Mercier, will you do me the favor to come and dine with me this evening? There we can talk over your business at leisure. And if Lord Lyons will step into my room with me now, we will discuss what he has to say to me.' 'If you refuse to see us together,' began the French envoy, with a courteous smile and a shrug. 'Certainly I do refuse to see you together, though I will see either of you separately, with pleasure, here or elsewhere.'"

The plan for a joint communication then and there broke down, and was never again attempted. The probability is that both these ministers were severely censured from home for

letting go an opportunity. Mr. Seward was right. On the face of it, it would not seem to make much difference whether what these men had to say was presented separately or jointly. But there was great difference in the moral effect. When France and England undertook to make a joint communication to Mr. Seward relating to the Civil War, they knew that their act was in the nature of a threat, and would be everywhere so regarded; and their hope was that, as a threat, it would be effective. They could not believe that the United States would long dare to disregard any suggestion made to them by two such powers acting together. Had Mr. Seward submitted to receive the joint communication, it would have been ascribed to fear, and would have had a discouraging effect throughout our country. But by refusing to receive it, he awakened the sympathy, and quickened the courage of the whole American people. There was not a soldier in camp who got newspapers from home, or heard the rumors from the Department of State, who was not proud at the thought that though his shoddy coat might be in rags, and his paper shoes coming to pieces, and his food stale, he had a secretary for foreign affairs who had the spirit to look the ambassadors of the two greatest

powers in the world in the face and tell them that he would not be bullied. Mr. Seward was never wanting in exhibitions of spirit, when these were what his cause demanded. This same year, in writing to France, he said: "Foreign intervention would oblige us to treat those who should attempt it as allies of the insurrectionary party, and to carry on the war against them as enemies. The case would only be aggravated, if several European states should combine in that intervention. The President and people of the United States deem the Union, which would then be at stake, worth all the cost and all the sacrifice of a contest with the world in arms, if such a contest should prove inevitable."

The spring of 1863 was a time of special discouragement to our Government, for the reason that France and England seemed at last about to attempt the long-threatened military intervention. But as the summer opened, an event occurred which became the subject of talk in all the diplomatic and political circles of Europe and America. A fleet of Russian ships of war entered the harbor at New York. It was a peaceful fleet, and it always remained so. There was nothing in its presence in our waters, if it was agreeable to the United States, that ought

to give offense to any other nation. It is common for the great powers to exhibit their war frigates in the ports of friendly governments, especially those with which they have commercial relations. To be sure, Russia had never sent so many ships to our shores before, and perhaps never would again. But there is no principle of international courtesy which limits the number of ships which may go on such a peaceful errand. Such was the talk about the matter. But there were two places in the world where the visit of the Russian fleet was the subject of painful curiosity. These were the foreign office in Paris and the foreign office in London. France and England were not quite easy in conscience. By the treaty of Paris, ratified in 1856, after the Crimean war, the two Western powers had inflicted a great humiliation upon Russia in prohibiting her from sailing her own ships of war in her own waters—those of the Black Sea. Russia submitted to this at the time, for it was her only alternative. Her great Chancellor said, "Russia never sulks; she meditates." France and England had been watching her ever since, fearing that at some inconvenient moment, she would appear in the field as the ally of an enemy. And now what meant this Russian fleet in New York harbor?

Was it the result of Prince Gortschakoff's meditation? And what would *it* do, if *they* attacked the line of the Yankee blockade? No one could answer. They might have addressed a note to the Russian Chancellor asking for an explanation. But to demand an explanation from a friendly power of an act perfectly proper in itself, is a greater offense than any such act ever can be. Doubtless they telegraphed their legations in different parts of the world, but the answer would always be, "We have no information." Early in winter, the squadron appeared in the Potomac, and visited Washington. Speculation broke out afresh. But no official explanation was ever made; perhaps none ever will be. It seems probable that no record of the purpose of the visit can be found either in Washington or St. Petersburg. All that I have been able to discover in our diplomatic correspondence relating to the subject, consists of a few mutual expressions of courtesy such as are usual in connection with a visit from ships of war of a friendly power. This is all we know. There are some things further, however, which it is pretty safe to conjecture. Mr. Seward perfectly understood the irritated feeling of Russia towards France and England, and the apprehensions of these powers in regard to Russia;

and would gladly avail himself of the strained relations of these governments to protect his country. The appearance of the Russian fleet was a splendid counter-irritant to the disturbed mental condition of France and England about our blockade. It was a wholesome diversion for their minds, and gave them something else to think of. It enabled them to defer to a more convenient season, as they had often done before, their plan to break the blockade. The Russian squadron remained about six months. When at length it had sailed, and the two powers might once more have considered their plan, the Union arms had made such progress that the cause of military intervention died a natural death. What I believe about the visit of the fleet is, that it was agreed upon in a private conversation between the Russian minister and Mr. Seward in Mr. Seward's back office. After that, everything would take care of itself. A mere hint from the minister to his chief at home would be all that would be needed. If Prince Gortschakoff had cherished no resentment, a little native sense of humor would have been enough to make him relish the suggestion and put it in practice.

Such are some of the expedients which Mr. Seward employed to gain a hearing for the

arguments which he addressed to France and England. But better perhaps to that end than any expedient, was the disposition which he showed to be just and to do right in any case where an officer of our Government had been in the wrong in dealing with any interest of England or other foreign power. One example of this will suffice. In November, 1861, Captain Wilkes, of the United States Steamer San Jacinto, had stopped upon the high seas the British Royal Mail Steamer, Trent, had arrested upon her decks Mr. Mason and Mr. Slidell, the Confederate commissioners, and had conveyed them as prisoners on board the San Jacinto. The act was very popular in the United States. The newspapers teemed with praise of Captain Wilkes. Here, at last, was a man with the true American spirit. The House of Representatives passed a resolution requesting the President to present to Captain Wilkes a gold medal with suitable devices expressive of the high sense entertained by Congress of his good conduct. President Lincoln was at first disposed to sustain the gallant naval officer. Up to that time his administration had done so few things that were popular, that it, perhaps, seemed to him a great pity to lose so excellent an opportunity to gain general applause. Mr.

Seward, however, upon carefully studying the question, reached the conclusion that the act was an unlawful invasion of neutral rights, and must be disavowed, and that the prisoners must be returned under the British flag. He accordingly prepared a dispatch to that effect addressed to the British minister. President Lincoln had said to him that, if he would prepare a paper in favor of surrendering the men, the President would prepare one on the other side, and they would compare views the next day. It was, perhaps, the only instance in which the President attempted to write a dispatch upon a question of foreign affairs. When they met, the President, good and candid man that he was, said to his Secretary, that he had not been able to prepare an argument that satisfied his own mind, and that Mr. Seward was right. The prisoners were returned, and went on their errand of mischief. But Mr. Seward, by this act of disinterestedness, secured the lasting respect of the British ministers, as is evident from the tone of all their dispatches to him; and he secured an increased willingness on their part to listen to his arguments against intervention. Moreover he regained the favor of his own countrymen. On reflection the people made up their minds that the war they had in hand was enough for the

present. The House resolution in regard to the gold medal for Captain Wilkes was indefinitely postponed after it reached the Senate, and that officer was left to the sole reward which comes from the consciousness of having done what he honestly thought to be his duty. That reward I believe he had. He honestly thought that the persons of Mr. Mason and Mr. Slidell were contraband of war, and that the Trent was as really guilty of violating law as if she were carrying military stores to the rebels. His mistake was in going to sea without a copy of Woolsey's "International Law" in his trunk. That he had the courage of his convictions there can be no doubt. Commander Williams, of the Trent, excused himself for surrendering Mr. Mason and his associate on the ground that the San Jacinto was only two hundred yards distant, that her ship's company was at quarters, that her ports were open and her tampions out. The reasons appear to be satisfactory. Captain Wilkes doubtless meant business.

But besides averting French and English intervention, Mr. Seward successfully performed the other work which has been mentioned as brought upon him by the war. He never ceased to oppose the French occupation of Mexico until it was brought to an end. As

early as September 26, 1863, he wrote a dispatch, in which he made it sufficiently clear to the French government, that, if the enterprise against Mexico was not abandoned, it must lead to war between France and the United States. It required no small degree of courage in Mr. Seward to take this ground at a time when the national life of his own country was in so much peril. This attitude he maintained until the close of the Civil War, and then became still more urgent. He gave Napoleon plainly to understand that the time had come for the evacuation of Mexico by the French army, and early in 1867, that event was accomplished. The German historian Müller holds that it was the diplomatic "either—or" of the United States—that is, "either leave or fight"—by which this result was reached.

In his diplomatic contest with the English government in regard to the injury done by Confederate vessels built in English ports, he obtained all the success which was possible under the circumstances. He did not wholly prevent, because no man could wholly have prevented, the building and sale of such vessels to the Confederacy; but the suit which he constantly urged for compensation for damage done to commerce by these rovers of the sea, was

pressed with such intelligence and spirit, and was brought so near to a successful issue at the close of his administration, that early in the administration of his successor, it was settled by a treaty under which an award for damages was paid by England to the United States of fifteen and a half millions of dollars.

Mr. Seward's success in performing the ordidary duties of his department during the eight years of his service there, has been generally recognized. We cannot dwell upon it. It may be enough to say that during this period he made forty useful treaties with foreign powers. Among these were a treaty with England for the suppression of the slave trade, one with Germany for the protection of the rights of naturalized citizens, and another with Russia for the purchase of Alaska. Had Mr. Seward had no duties to perform growing out of war, I think that history must still have assigned him an important place among useful ministers of State. But when we consider both the work of peace and the work of war which he did, we must rank him with the great rulers of men—with Pericles—with the Duke of Sully —with Oxenstiern—with the elder Pitt—with Sir Robert Peel—with Prince Bismarck—with Count Cavour. To apply to him a single

sentence used by the historian Mommsen in reference to Hannibal, "He was a great man."

Mr. Seward's reputation will grow with time. His contemporaries were and are too near him to get a just or complete view of his work. Men who have traveled among the declivities of a famous mountain have sometimes expressed their disappointment. They saw some noble and attractive objects, but some also that appeared mysterious, dangerous, or repellent—some that were obscured by mists, or half hidden behind projecting crags. They saw broken, imperfect, and unsymmetrical parts, but nowhere saw the mountain. It was not until they had descended, and traveled far away upon the plain below, or sailed out upon the neighboring ocean, that, looking back, they saw the mountain come out in its grand proportions—in its symmetry and unity—against the horizon. A multitude of parts which had seemed to be a rough, disorderly, inexplicable scene, are now rounded into a beautiful whole. They see how solidly the mountain's broad base rests upon the earth, and how serenely its blue height reposes in the heavens. What distance does for the mountain, time does for great men, and will do for Mr. Seward. As yet, he is too large to be seen at a single view. Many parts of his

life seem imperfect, disconnected, inconsistent, and to many parts that should appear noble, men's eyes are blinded by the mists of prejudice. But time will clear the mists, and soften the outlines, and restore the proportions, and bring out the massive unity, until his character shall stand out upon the mighty field of history, the grand and majestic object that it is.

His rounded life will some day win
"A glory from its being far;
And orb into the perfect star
We saw not when we moved therein."

THE HAYES-TILDEN ELECTORAL COMMISSION.

[ATLANTIC MONTHLY, OCTOBER, 1893.]

THE Forty-fourth Congress assembled in its second session on the 4th of December, 1876, under circumstances which caused unusual solicitude. A presidential election had been held in November, and the result was contested. There were 369 electoral votes, of which 185 were necessary to a choice. Of the 369 votes, Samuel J. Tilden confessedly had 184, lacking but one of the required majority. Rutherford B. Hayes had only 163 undisputed votes, but his friends claimed, in addition, the votes of Florida, Louisiana, Oregon, and South Carolina, with an aggregate of 22 electors, which would make his total vote 185, precisely the number needed to secure his inauguration. It was thus necessary that the votes of all these disputed States should be counted for General Hayes to make him President, whereas, should Mr. Tilden gain but one of these, or but one vote from one of them, the victory would be his.

From the States just named there were two sets of returns, one favorable to General Hayes, the other to Mr. Tilden. The Hayes or Republican returns had, in general, the character or quality that we call regular, that is, they were made up and forwarded by officials regularly appointed for that purpose by political organizations recognized by national authority as state governments, and actually holding power as such. The Republicans contended that, in counting the electoral vote, we could not go behind these regular returns; that to do so would be an invasion of the constitutional sphere of the States; that the Constitution expressly declares that each State shall appoint its electors "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct;" that thus the State had a right to determine how its electors should be chosen, who they were when chosen, and how the report of this fact should be made. To this the Democrats responded that these returns were a product of fraud and dishonesty; that, in preparing them, the vote of whole precincts, parishes, and counties had been thrown out in order to secure Hayes electors; that fraud vitiates everything; that no pretended States rights should serve as a shelter to fraud; furthermore, that the State governments, so called, were not really

such; that they did not represent the people of those States, but were themselves the product of fraud and corruption, and were kept in place only by what was called the "moral influence" of Federal bayonets. The Republicans retorted that the character of State governments could be denied to these organizations only by robbing the freedmen of the ballot guaranteed to them by the Constitution, and that when the votes of precincts, parishes, and counties had been thrown out, it was done in obedience to law, which commanded that this course should be pursued in communities where terrorism had been exercised to such an extent as seriously to affect the result.

Thus the issue was made up. Members of Congress came together feeling strongly themselves and reflecting the strong feeling which prevailed in the country. The eight millions of voters who had taken part in the election had been about equally divided. Those of each party were convinced that they had gained an honest victory, and were indignant with those of the other party for denying or even doubting it. The feeling of mutual hostility had been greatly intensified by party leaders, orators, and presses. In some of our cities it took all the terrors of a police court to keep Democrats and

Republicans from breaking the peace. Members of Congress who had begun by being angry on their own account, and who felt under some obligation to represent the anger of their constituents, exploded when they began to discuss the subject with their opponents, at the hotels and in the club rooms of the city of Washington. It took quiet and sensible men some time to learn that they could gain nothing by arguing the question with those of opposite political views, and men of different stamp never did learn it.

Under these unfavorable conditions—conditions such as had never before followed a presidential election in this country—Congress and the nation approached the counting of the electoral vote. The practical question in all men's minds, and on nearly all men's tongues, was, by whom shall it be decided who has been elected President of the United States? Who shall determine what are the proper electoral votes, distinguishing between those that are genuine and those that are spurious? Who shall count the votes and declare the result? Where is the tribunal to which this issue can be submitted, whose authority will not be questioned, and whose decision will be accepted as final?

There were many theories upon this subject of the count, but none of them seemed to be practicable. The only light which the Constitution sheds upon it is in these words: "The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the vote shall then be counted." By whom? We are nowhere expressly told, and hence, wide scope is given for the partisan imagination. It is indeed added that the person having a majority of all the electoral votes shall be President; but no further aid is furnished us in our effort to ascertain what authority is to decide who has, or has not, this majority.

The theory prevalent among Republicans was that the counting should be done by the President of the Senate. For this theory it was urged that precedent was in its favor, the President of the Senate having generally counted and declared the vote since the formation of the government; and further, it was asked who would so naturally count the vote as he who opens the certificates containing the statement of it in the presence of the two Houses? Many names, great in the history of the Republic, were quoted as authorities on the side of this theory, but, to say nothing of other objections,

there was one practical difficulty which was fatal to it. The President of the Senate was a Republican, whose opinions were presumably known, and there probably was not a Democrat in the United States who would willingly have submitted to his decision.

Another theory which was advocated by a portion of the Democratic party was that the House of Representatives should do the counting, the Senate being present merely as spectators. It was argued that inasmuch as the Constitution lays upon the House the duty of choosing a President, in case there has been a failure to elect by the people, it is necessary that the House, by previously counting the vote, should ascertain whether such failure exists. But the House of Representatives was Democratic by a large majority, and it would have been as unsatisfactory to Republicans to have the vote declared by the House as it would have been to Democrats to have it declared by the President of the Senate.

A third theory, deservedly received with more favor than either of the preceding, was that the counting should be done by both Houses, each having equal authority and responsibility with the other. The practical difficulty here was that the two Houses were of

opposite politics; that each would negative the action of the other, and that hence no result could be reached. A colleague of mine in the House, Mr. Charles Foster, afterward Governor of Ohio, and recently Secretary of the Treasury, proposed another solution of the problem which I thought a good one. He introduced a bill providing that Congress should submit the case to the Supreme Court, and that its decision should be held to be conclusive. But this plan was unacceptable to the whole body of Democrats, and, I suppose, could not have received a single Democratic vote, for the philosophical reason that of the nine judges at that time on the Supreme Bench, there were but two of Democratic antecedents.

I will mention but one more theory.

A few Democrats of an ancient and harmless school were delighted with a discovery which they had made in the writings of Jefferson. It appeared that that great man had suggested that the electoral vote should be counted by the two Houses, not as separate organizations, but as merged in one convention, in which the vote of a Senator should count for precisely as much as the vote of a Representative. These amiable theorists would have had us agree upon this plan as a happy method of settling all our

difficulties. Now, in the Forty-fourth Congress there were 74 Senators and 292 Representatives, the latter being almost four times as numerous as the former. Hence, in all questions requiring the action of both Houses, the vote of one Senator was about equal to that of four Representatives. The Jeffersonian idea might have proved to be a great success, could our friends have made it appear agreeable to 74 Senators, representing, many of them, half the population and resources of great and proud States, to submit to the immense diminution of power implied in their being placed, in the proposed convention, individually on a level with members of the other House. But as there was a great deal of human nature in the country that year, especially in the Halls of Congress, this theory of the past soon proved to be impracticable, and was heard of no more. It was evident that although Jefferson might have been responsible for the original suggestion, he was not responsible for the time and method of its application.

Such were the theories that were under discussion, and such were the obstacles which they encountered. It is now evident that the counting of the electoral vote could not have been safely committed to any of the agencies which

were ordinarily recognized by different parties as the constitutional and proper tribunals for the performance of that duty. The responsibility could not have been laid upon any of these agencies without giving a positive advantage to one of the two parties, and thus encountering stubborn resistance from the other. As each party had control of one House of Congress, no plan could be successful in which both parties did not concur. But that Congress should promptly adopt some method of adjusting differences was demanded by the peace of the country. The situation was serious. Some thoughtful men felt that perhaps the greatest peril that the Republic had encountered was not that of the Civil War. It was repeatedly stated on the floor of the House of Representatives, and apparently believed by the majority, that if the Republican party should proceed, through the President of the Senate, to count the votes of the disputed States, and declare them for General Hayes, the House would then proceed to elect Mr. Tilden, or to count the vote and declare him elected by the nation. There would then have been a dual presidency, a divided army and navy, a divided people, and probably civil war. What plan could be devised to save the country from the evils that threatened it?

The answer was not easy. Everywhere about the Capitol were seen thoughtful and troubled faces. The short winter days seemed gloomy, and the hours of wakefulness in the night were prolonged by anxious thought. Things were constantly occurring which revealed the extent of both the difficulty and the danger. One day a leading Democrat went across the House to General Garfield's seat, and, repeating a prediction which he had previously made, said that, within a hundred days, people would be cutting each other's throats. Republicans who happened to overhear the conversation did not, perhaps, regard the statement as improbable. My colleague from Ohio, Mr. Banning, a man kindly disposed, declared in a speech, that, if the Republicans should attempt to carry out their theory of the election, and if a part of the army with eighty rounds of ammunition, and the navy, should be ordered to support them, the people would put them all down. Mr. Goode, of Virginia, one of the ablest and best of the Southern members, said, upon the floor of the House, that, if the two parties went on in their respective courses, they would soon reach a point where one or the other must make an ignominious surrender, or they must fight. "Are gentlemen prepared for

the latter alternative?" he exclaimed. A shout of "Yes" went up from the Republican side of the House.

In view of such a state of feeling as this, it was a satisfaction to know that, early in the session, broad-minded and patriotic men were beginning to study the difficult problem. It was thought well, in the first place, that the House should be better informed as to the extent of its own rights and duties. To this end a committee was appointed to inquire and report upon the subject. The Speaker was pleased to name the writer of this article as a member of the committee. My first feeling was one of gratification at the compliment. But, upon reflection, it seemed so plain to me that the committee should be composed of great constitutional lawyers, that, as soon as the House adjourned, I hastened to the Speaker and tendered my declination, which was accepted. A few days later, he filled the vacancy by appointing Judge McDill, of Iowa, who creditably performed the duties of the place. Some good work was done. Mr. Seelye, afterwards President of Amherst College, belonged to the committee, as did also Mr. Burchard, of Illinois, a man of much varied knowledge, and since Director of the Mint. Both majority and minority

reports were made, which served, in a measure, as guides to the respective parties in the House in their subsequent labors.

On the 7th of December, Mr. McCrary, of Iowa, introduced a resolution that a committee should be appointed by the Speaker, to act in conjunction with any similar committee appointed by the Senate in preparing and reporting some legislative measure for counting the electoral vote. This resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and on the 14th of December was reported back to the House and passed. Notice of this action was at once sent to the Senate. On the 15th of December, a resolution of like character was offered in that body by Mr. Edmunds, of Vermont, providing for the appointment of a committee of the Senate to act with that of the House. On the 18th this resolution was passed by the Senate, and the same day the House was notified of the fact. These committees of the Senate and House were appointed December the 21st and 22d respectively, Mr. Edmunds being chairman of the Senate committee, and Mr. Payne, of Ohio, since Senator Payne, chairman of that of the House. Each committee consisted of seven members. Frequent sessions of these committees, at first separate and afterward joint

sessions, with much laborious investigation and much discussion of the merits of different plans, were held from this time until January 18, 1877, when a carefully matured bill, with an accompanying report, was submitted by Mr. Edmunds to the Senate. The report was signed by all the fourteen members of the two committees with the exception of Senator Morton, of Indiana. The bill was soon launched upon the stormy sea of Congressional debate, to take its chances in the hurricane conflict of prejudice and opinion.

The gentlemen of this joint committee—a joint committee we may henceforth call it, although it was not strictly such, the jealousy of the Houses having forbidden the use of that designation—the gentlemen of this committee spoke with some reserve, as the proprieties demanded, of their month's work in the committee room. Some of them, however, did divulge to personal friends that they had found their task to be delicate, difficult, laborious, trying to the patience, provoking, and often very discouraging. Many plans had been, of course, rejected. One of these would sometimes break upon their minds like an inspiration, and fill them with hope, only to encounter, after a morning's debate, some insuperable objection and be

abandoned. Communications which they received from the outside showed with what jealousy they were watched by the two parties, both in Congress and throughout the country. They soon discovered that nothing but defeat could be expected for any measure they should adopt which did not exhibit absolute impartiality toward the two parties. To quote from a speech of Mr. Thurman in the Senate, "It was perfectly clear that any bill that gave the least advantage, ay, the weight of the dust in the balance, to either party, could not become the law of the land." To make the plan acceptable, it must be such that no one could give even a sensible guess beforehand as to what result it would produce.

The principal points of the bill, as finally reported to the two Houses, were the following: The Senate and House were to meet in the Hall of the House, as formerly, for counting the electoral vote. The President of the Senate was to be the presiding officer, and the vote was to be counted by him, or by the tellers under his direction, in accordance with precedent, until some State might be reached to whose vote objections should be offered. The objections should then be put in proper form, and, if there were but one return from

the State which had occasioned the disagreement, the Houses should separate, and each House should render a decision upon the objections submitted to it. The Houses should then again meet, and the result of their action be announced. The vote of the State, which, it will be observed, had but a single return, should then be counted, unless it appeared that both Houses had concurred in rejecting it. But when, in the progress of the count, a State might be reached from which there was more than one return, the presiding officer should call for objections to any or all of the returns. The objections, when they had been prepared, together with all the returns and accompanying papers, should then be submitted to the judgment of a Commission which should be constituted as follows: The Commission was to consist of fifteen members, of whom five were to be Representatives, five Senators, and five Justices of the Supreme Court; the five Representatives upon the Commission to be chosen by the House, and the five Senators by the Senate. Of the five Justices, four were virtually designated by the bill, and these four were to elect the fifth. It was assumed by common consent, and was agreed by caucuses of the two parties in both House and Senate, that of the five

Representatives to be chosen, three would be Democrats and two Republicans; that of the five Senators, three would be Republicans and two Democrats. Of the four Justices that were indicated in the bill, two were of Democratic antecedents and two of Republican. The spirit of the bill required that the fifth man whom these Justices were to select should be neutral as regards the two parties, or, if possible, should be half Republican and half Democrat. Should this arrangement be perfectly carried out, there would, as the reader will see, be just seven and a half Republicans and seven and a half Democrats on the Commission. And yet, as the number of the Commissioners was an uneven number, a decision must be reached; for, however desirous the fifteenth member might be of rendering a decision on both sides, the absolute simplicity of the human will in its action would have prevented his doing so. He must decide wholly for or against each return from a State.

The bill provided that whatever powers were possessed by the two Houses of Congress, in counting the electoral vote, should also be possessed by the Commission. Should it be asked whether the Commission had power to go behind the returns made by the State officers, the

answer was that it had not, unless the two Houses had such power. If it were asked whether the Commission was forbidden to exercise such power, the answer was, not unless the Houses were so forbidden. Indeed, the Senate, under the leadership of Mr. Edmunds, voted down, during the same hour of one day, two antagonistic propositions upon this subject; namely, the proposition that the Commission should have the right to go behind the returns from a State, and the proposition that it should not have such right. Beyond the proposition that the powers of the Commission were to be the same as those of the two Houses, there was no attempt in the bill to define what they were. With this limitation only, which was scarcely a limitation, the Commission was made the absolute judge of the extent of its own jurisdiction. It was to a Commission so constituted and with such powers that the returns from Florida, Louisiana, Oregon, and South Carolina, with all accompanying papers, were to be referred. It was made the duty of the Commission to find who were the legal electors and what was their vote in each of those States, and report it to Congress. When such report should be made, the House must meet without delay to hear it

announced. If objections were offered, the Houses must again separate, each pronouncing judgment upon them in its own chamber. They were then to reassemble, to hear these judgments read. The decision of the Commission must then stand as valid, unless it should be rejected by the concurrent action of both Houses. As these Houses, however, were of opposite politics, such a result, whatever the decision might be, was one that never could be reached.

Such were the methods of procedure provided in this bill—the method in case of States to whose vote there was no objection, in case of States sending but one return to which there was objection, and States forwarding double returns to which, of course, objections would be numerous. These methods were to be continued until the votes of all the States should be counted in alphabetical order and the grand result declared. Had any statement in detail of the powers to be exercised by the Commission been contained in the bill, it would have insured its instant defeat. It was essential to the success of the measure that neither the members of the Commission nor those of the two Houses should be able to foresee what powers the Commission would assume. The

form in which the bill was finally left exhibited an impartiality in regard to the two great parties as nearly absolute as it was possible to attain.

Whatever faults the bill might have, it had the great merit that, should it become a law, and its execution not be prevented by revolutionary measures, it must make somebody President of the United States. This, no doubt, was the result that the common welfare demanded. It was more important that the presidential issue should be decided effectively than that it should be decided rightly. If the alternative were a decision wholly right which should be questioned by half the nation, or a decision wholly wrong which the whole country would accept, the latter, no doubt, was the result to be desired.

This bill of 1877, to provide for and regulate the counting of the electoral vote, was one of the great legislative measures of history. It exhibited ability, skill, knowledge of men, fertility in resources, fairness, patriotism, statesmanship. It was worthy of a great crisis in national affairs, and deserved to be passed.

But before we follow the fortunes of this bill in Congress, it will be necessary to say something further of its relations to the two parties.

It was from the beginning a Democratic rather than a Republican measure. It was indeed inaugurated, as we have seen, in the Senate and House, by two Republicans who remained its faithful and efficient friends. Many patriotic men, of both parties and in both Houses, advocated it from the first and continued to do so to the end. But the proportion of Democrats in both Houses, and especially in the House of Representatives, who supported the measure throughout, was much larger than the proportion of Republicans. When among Democrats, on their side of the House, you felt that the atmosphere was friendly to the bill; while upon the Republican side it was regarded with general suspicion. The explanation is not far to seek. As the regular returns from the disputed States were favorable to General Hayes, the Republicans had what was regarded as a *prima facie* case, and the burden of proof must rest upon their opponents. The presiding officer of the Senate and of the two Houses, when they should meet together, was a Republican, and, whatever theories might be held, his opinions would have some weight in counting the vote. Further, the Chief Magistrate was a Republican, and one not much inclined to surrender when he thought he was right. He would be

pretty likely to see to it that the man he thought honestly elected should be duly inaugurated. Under these circumstances, the Democrats, or at least a majority of them, thought that they could lose nothing, and might gain much, by an impartial law which should bind all parties. Republicans, on the other hand, were naturally content to retain the advantages of their position. There was another consideration which affected the relative friendliness of the two parties to the bill. There was a sharp issue, as we know, between Democrats and Republicans in regard to the power of Congress to go behind the returns made by State officers. Republicans believed this to be unconstitutional, while Democrats declared that justice demanded it should be done. It was early understood that the bill which the committee were preparing would be neutral on this point. While it would not authorize the Commission to go behind the returns, it would not forbid their doing so. Many Republicans felt that they could not vote for a measure which would even permit such an invasion of the organic law. They contended that it was a compromise of principle like that of 1820, which condemned half the country to slavery; like that of 1850, which gave us the Fugitive Slave

Law. It belonged to a class of weak concessions which had always injured the country and ruined every party that had touched them. They had a candidate, lawfully elected, and why should they sacrifice his rights, and the rights of the people that voted for him, through the still worse sacrifice of constitutional principles? I shared in the views of my party, and voted with the majority of my friends in the House against the bill. It was a mistake. We lost an opportunity. I did not give my vote, however, without much previous hesitation. I still have in my possession a rough outline of an argument in favor of the bill, which I made out late one night in my room, that I might see how it looked. In my present judgment, it is a better argument than one which I made afterwards in the House against the bill. It was an experiment which failed that I made upon my own mind. The feeling that I had no right to sacrifice a just cause upon grounds of doubtful constitutionality compelled me to vote in the negative.

I must not fail to present, as pertinent in this connection, a much more important piece of personal history, which was never fully understood by the public, and now seems, though quite undeservedly, to be almost forgotten.

We have seen how important it was that the fifth place among the Justices of the Supreme Court who were to serve upon the Commission should be filled, if possible, by a man just half Democrat and half Republican. This, the reader will remember, was demanded by our arithmetic. In no other way was it possible so to divide the Commission that each party should have exactly half of it. The man needed for this purpose seemed to have been supplied in Mr. Justice Davis, of Illinois. This gentleman was an able judge and a worthy man with a strong taste for active politics. Originally a Republican and an intimate friend of Mr. Lincoln, he had been nominated for the presidency in 1872 by the Labor Reform Party, and had received nearly a hundred votes, the same year, in the National Convention of the Liberal Republicans, and had been talked of as a Democratic candidate in 1876. These events, on some principle which I do not fully understand, were thought to have set him down about midway between the two leading parties. He belonged to a highly respectable class of politicians known as Independents. To anticipate a little, the impartiality of his attitude toward the two parties was strikingly illustrated, at a later period, in the United States Senate. It

was said of him there, no doubt with some jocose exaggeration, that he seemed to be trying to divide his influence, his voice, and his vote, as equally as possible between Democrats and Republicans; that if he voted twice in succession with the same party, he appeared to be alarmed lest he should take on the character of a partisan, and made haste to restore the healthful balance of his mind and of his political action, by voting next time with the other side. In justice to him, it should be remembered that the position of independency in politics was at that time less understood, had been less practiced, and hence was more difficult of graceful maintenance than it now is. A man as richly endowed as we have seen Judge Davis to have been, with the grace of impartiality, with a talent for being on both sides, would seem to have been the very man that was needed for the fifth judge upon the Commission. If the ideal were half Democrat and half Republican, how could it have been more perfectly realized? Accordingly, it had been early understood that the other judges would agree upon him for the place, and that he would accept it, though doubtless feeling that there were nearly equal reasons both for and against his doing so. Assuming that Judge Davis would be the

fifteenth Commissioner, the Democrats, with good grounds, counted upon his giving them the victory. It will be remembered that in order to elect Hayes it was necessary that the Republicans should gain all of the four disputed States. If any State or any portion of a State went adversely, Hayes was defeated. It was necessary that at least four successive decisions relating to these four States should all be given in favor of the Republicans. Now it was morally certain—it was as certain as the future action of a free agent can ever be—that Judge Davis would never give four decisions in succession, upon difficult and delicate questions, in favor of the same party. It was inevitable that he would not decide all these issues for the Republicans, and if he failed them but once their case was hopeless. Hence from the time when the main features of the forthcoming bill had come to be understood, until some time after the middle of January, there was a general expectation of victory among Democrats, and of defeat among Republicans. When you met a Democrat, his face wore an expression of evident, though restrained satisfaction, while Republicans looked troubled and depressed. This was largely due to the general impression that Judge Davis would be placed upon the

Commission. Here was another of those causes which predisposed Democrats to commit themselves for the bill, and Republicans to commit themselves against it.

But now occurred one of those remarkable things which in reading fiction you stop to criticise as improbable, though they occasion no surprise to the thoughtful student of history. About the middle of January, the legislature of Illinois began balloting for United States Senator. The vote was so close between Democrats and Republicans that five Independents held the balance of power. Several unsuccessful ballots were taken, and there seemed no prospect of a result until negotiations were commenced for a union between Democrats and Independents, with a view to the election of Judge Davis. Late one evening, I heard that our prospective Commissioner had decided to permit the use of his name as a candidate. The next morning, entering the Hall of the House some time before the hour for opening, I observed that the Democratic side was already well filled, and that its occupants were collected in groups which appeared to be engaged in animated discussion. I did not intrude, but learned from Republican friends, whose opportunities for hearing had been better than mine, that our

neighbors were all talking about Judge Davis. Republicans also showed a deep interest in the news. It seemed to be generally admitted that the use of Judge Davis's name in an active political canvass, whatever the result of it might be, would disqualify him for a place on the Commission. We soon learned that this view of the case was also taken by himself. The effect of the withdrawal of his name as a candidate for the Commission undoubtedly was to make Democrats less and Republicans more hopeful as to the result. It no doubt made some votes for the bill on the Republican side, and deprived it of some on the Democratic. But this change occurred quietly among the more obscure members. Those on both sides who had openly committed themselves commonly adhered to the positions they had taken. It was creditable to the patriotism and consistency of both Democrats and Republicans, as a body, that they did not permit what had occurred to change their purpose in regard to the bill.

The name of Mr. Justice Bradley was now thought of as a substitute for that of Justice Davis. Of the occupants of the Supreme Bench whose names had not yet been considered, he was the most conservative. He had commended himself to Democrats by holding strong

opinions, when on the bench, against the constitutionality of the Enforcement Act. He had held court in Louisiana, where he was popular, and had given a conservative opinion in the decision of the Supreme Court upon what were known as the "Grant Parish" cases. He had never been in sympathy with the original abolitionists, and would probably have found it difficult to attach the same importance to the interests of a black man that he did to those of a white man. Upon a comparison of views in regard to his antecedents, the faces of Democrats began to wear a look of returning cheerfulness. They felt that, if he should be placed upon the Commission, they could still look forward hopefully to the result.

Thus much it has seemed necessary to say in regard to the attitude of the two parties towards this great measure. Let us do exact justice to both. That there were some mere trimmers and time-servers in both parties cannot be doubted; but it is equally certain that the general tone of feeling was earnest and manly. The debate had a serious character which commended it to the approval of thoughtful visitors. There was much party feeling on both sides, but a prevalent sincerity of purpose. The desire to learn what duty and the common

welfare demanded was general. It was no doubt party feeling which increased the friendliness of the Democrats to the bill in the earlier period and diminished it in the later. A few of them were bitter opponents of the bill from the beginning, and became obstructionists towards the end. But after making all the deductions from the credit due them which these facts require, it must still be admitted that a powerful, perhaps a controlling influence was exerted among them by patriotism and true statesmanship. We cannot withhold our admiration from the work which they or a majority of them did. To both parties in this crisis we must accord general honesty of purpose. But as what the Democrats did was objectively right, as they had the principal share in the support of a bill which now appears to have been necessary to the public order, they will stand fairest, so far as this legislation is concerned, upon the page of that history which is less curious about hidden motives than about the utility of measures.

There were no Republican obstructionists. But it would be rash to say there would not have been any, had the election of Mr. Tilden seemed as probable as did that of General Hayes.

But it is time to inquire what progress was made by the electoral bill in the two Houses. It has been stated that this bill was submitted to the Senate by Mr. Edmunds, on the 18th of January. The debate commenced on the 20th, and continued almost uninterruptedly to the 25th. The 25th and the 26th were mostly occupied with the discussion of the subject in the House. This debate must no doubt be classed in history with the great intellectual conflicts of Congress. Senator Edmunds, who reported the bill to the Senate, and who was understood to be the author both of the bill and of the report, made the opening speech. It was perhaps the best speech made in favor of the measure, not only because it was learned, logical, and persuasive, but still more because it was wise. It contained just enough to put the bill in an acceptable light. It was great for what it omitted. It was not delivered in order to make a great speech, but to secure the passage of the bill. It explained difficulties, soothed prejudice, conciliated opposition, and made the need of the country for amicable adjustment stand out in a clear light. He was the presiding spirit of the debate in the Senate. He was constantly in his place, and much of the time on his feet. By courteous interruptions, he

supplemented the speeches of his friends with needed arguments, and helped his opponents to some ignored or forgotten fact which made a half hour's talk irrelevant or innocuous. He exhibited a rapier-like swiftness and point which considerably diminished the desire of the opposition to prolong the debate. It may fairly be said that he did more than any other man for the success of the bill. It was one of the occasions which caused the Vermont judge to be considered the first man in the Senate. He was ably supported by Senators Bayard, Thurman, Frelinghuysen, and Conkling, and was warmly opposed by Morton, Sherman, Cameron, and Eaton. Mr. Blaine, then a new member of the Senate, spoke briefly but exceedingly well, expressing his regret at not being able to support the bill. In the House, Hoar, Foster, and McCrary, among Republicans, and Payne, Lamar, Springer, Hill, Abram S. Hewitt, and Tucker, among Democrats, delivered noticeable speeches in favor of the measure. Strong efforts were made against it by Garfield, Hale, Lawrence, and others on the Republican side, and by Proctor Knott and Blackburn on the Democratic. The debate included constitutional arguments, historical discussion, and patriotic appeal, enlivened occasionally, by humor

and witty retort. There was also some downright raving. It would require a separate paper were I to indulge in quotation and appropriate comment. Many of the speeches in both House and Senate were elaborately prepared. Some of them were remarkable for beautiful and impressive perorations. I commend them to the attention of those of my readers who are fond of literary studies.

As the debate advanced in the Senate, and the bill was examined and privately discussed by members of both Houses, it was more and more evident that it would become a law. The tide of feeling in its favor rose higher every day, and the response from most parts of the country greatly aided it. On the morning of January 25, the bill passed the Senate, and it passed the House on the 26th. It might have received the signature of the Chief Magistrate on the following day, but President Grant was absent in Maryland, attending, I believe, some exposition of mechanical industry. But, on the 29th, the bill was not only signed by the President, but was returned to the Senate with a message of cordial approval. On the 30th, the Commissioners were all elected. The Senate chose the following gentlemen: Edmunds, Morton, Frelinghuysen, Thurman, and Bayard. The

House chose Representatives Payne, Hunton, Abbott, Garfield, and Hoar. The Justices who had already been designated by the bill were Clifford, Strong, Miller, and Field; and these gentlemen agreed upon Mr. Justice Bradley as the fifteenth member of the Commission. On the 1st of February, the Commission organized with Mr. Justice Clifford as president, and notified both House and Senate of the fact. On the same day, as was provided by the new law, the counting of the electoral vote commenced, and was the absorbing object of attention in both Houses, and I might almost say in the whole country, until it was completed on the 2d of March.

The members of both Houses and both parties came together with cheerful faces in the Hall of the House of Representatives to begin the count. Hope and good humor prevailed on all sides. The spectacle was one of unusual interest and had attracted visitors from remote parts of the country. At one o'clock P. M., the doorkeeper of the House announced that the Senate of the United States was at the door. The Senators, preceded by their proper officers, were immediately admitted and received by the Representatives standing. The ceremonial prescribed by the law was duly

observed. The President of the Senate was seated in the Speaker's chair, as president of the joint meeting. At his left sat the Speaker, and in front and below sat the subordinate officers of both Houses. The Senators occupied the body of the Hall upon the right of the presiding officer. Two tellers were appointed on the part of each House. The burdens of the presiding officer, Senator Ferry of Michigan, who had been made President of the Senate upon the death of Vice-President Wilson, were greatly lightened by the guidance and support afforded by the new law; but his duties were still delicate and arduous, and were performed with a dignity, watchfulness, impartiality, and painstaking correctness which secured general commendation. The counting went on briskly through the earlier States of the alphabetical list, Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, and Delaware. It was immaterial who counted the votes of these States. They could count themselves. But when the State of Florida was reached, double certificates were opened, and objections were at once heard from different parts of the Hall. Both certificates, together with the various objections and all papers in the case, were then sent to the Commission. That tribunal

was occupied until the 9th of February in reaching a result which was not achieved without much wearisome investigation and listening to many arguments from both sides. On the 10th this decision was laid before the joint meeting of Congress. It was found that the seven men upon the Commission who had been chosen avowedly as Democrats had voted for the Tilden electors; the seven men who had been chosen as Republicans had voted for the Hayes electors; and the conservative member had determined the result by voting with the Republicans. Objections were at once raised to the decision, and the two Houses separated, the Senate voting to sustain it, and the House voting the opposite, which, of course, left it binding under the law. It would have been singular had there not been a somewhat marked change in the feeling of the parties in regard to the operation of the law after this decision. It may be thought that, when the law was passed, there was no further peril; and this would indeed have been true except for disorderly and obstructive methods. The result of the vote must be announced before twelve o'clock on the 4th of March. The time was becoming short. Owing to delays, some of them unnecessary, the vote of Florida was

not counted until the 12th. This left only sixteen full working days to complete the count. There were still three States with double returns, which of course would be sharply contested and must be referred to the Commission, which was a judicial body and could not be hurried. Minor difficulties were being raised for a purpose, it was thought, which increased the delay. But the majority of both Houses stood by the arrangement, and the great machine, though heavy and slow, still ground on. The vote of Louisiana was counted on the 20th, that of Oregon on the 24th, and both were counted for Hayes. On the last day of February, when there were but three more working days, the vote of South Carolina had not been counted, which was also true of Vermont and Wisconsin, in regard to both of which captious objector were awaiting their opportunity. It was at this point that there broke forth a bitter and persistent opposition by means of dilatory motions. This opposition, at one time, assumed such proportions as to fill patriotic minds with alarm lest the declaration of the final result should not be reached. This calamity to the country might not have been averted, had not the man for the occasion been found in Samuel J. Randall, the Democratic Speaker of

the House. He was a warm partisan, but a man of firmness and conscience in regard to his obligations to the Constitution and the laws. His oath to support these was not to him an unmeaning form. He had a clear conviction that it was his duty not to permit the object of the electoral law to be defeated by any factious policy of obstruction. He had a strength of will equal to the emergency, and he put it to good use. On the 24th of February, the Speaker, in declining to entertain a motion which, though parliamentary and suitable in itself, was dilatory in effect, made a ruling, involving a principle of the highest importance and of the greatest practical value for all legislative bodies. I give his words. The Chair "rules that when the Constitution of the United States directs anything to be done, or when the law under the Constitution of the United States, enacted in obedience thereto, directs any act by this House, it is not in order to make any motion to obstruct or impede the execution of that injunction of the Constitution and the laws." After that decision there was comparative good order for two or three days. On the 28th of February, the Speaker having refused to entertain a motion which was of a dilatory character, a member appealed from the decision

of the Chair. The Speaker refused to entertain the appeal. Then followed a scene of great clamor and confusion, the obstructionists insisting upon it that the Chair should admit the appeal. But as that officer only gripped his gavel the tighter, and his always long under jaw seemed to be growing longer, they had to abandon the effort. We then had comparative quiet until the following day, when the disorder reached its height and was, at times, of almost a threatening character. From ten o'clock A. M. on the 1st of March until four o'clock A. M. on the 2d, we were constantly in our seats. Owing, perhaps, to an understanding reached among themselves, the previous night, the obstructionists made a united and desperate effort to waste the time of the House by dilatory motions. During much of this time, the Speaker stood in his place deciding questions of order in the midst of noisy and hostile demonstrations. He was subjected to a strain upon voice and nerve and physical strength such as few men could have endured. At times he was visited with a storm of questions and reproaches. Would he not entertain a privileged motion? He would not. Would he not put a motion for a recess? a motion for a call of the House? a motion to excuse some

member from voting? a motion to reconsider? a motion to lay something on the table? He would not. Were not these motions in order under the rules? They were. Would he not then submit some one of them to the House? He would not. Was he not an oppressor, a tyrant, a despot? He was not. Would he not then put some dilatory motion? He would not. Would he not entertain an appeal to the House from his own decision? He would not. Why would he not? Because of his obligations to law. This is a condensed statement of a struggle which was going on for several hours. The scene was varied on one or two occasions by a proposal that the House proceed at once to the election of a President of the United States, which, of course, was ruled out of order.

A better idea of what this struggle was may be conveyed by a quotation from the "Congressional Record." It is but just to add, as will be seen, that several of the persons introduced here were acting in good faith and not with the intention of increasing the disorder.

Mr. Eden. I call for the regular order.

Mr. Caulfield. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand that the two

hours' debate allowed by the law is to begin now, under the ruling of the Chair?

The Speaker. The gentleman is right in so understanding.

Mr. Caulfield. Well, sir, I appeal from that decision. I contend that there is no power in this House to proceed to the consideration of this question until we know what the question is. Under the present circumstances we do not know what the question is.

The Speaker. That is for the House to determine, not the Chair.

Mr. Caulfield. But until that certificate is opened, it is impossible for us to know what objections we are to consider.

Mr. O'Brien. We must have the certificate before we can discuss and vote upon this question.

Mr. Watterson. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know whether the progress of this debate is in order or not.

The Speaker. It is in order. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Poppleton) is recognized; and if he does not desire to speak, the Chair will recognize some other gentleman.

Mr. O'Brien. Does not the Chair entertain the appeal from this decision?

Mr. Caulfield. I insist on my appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The Speaker. The Chair declines to entertain the appeal.

(Cries of "That is right," and applause.)

Mr. Springer. I hope the Chair will not insist upon that position. This is one of the most important questions that ever came before this House. (Cries of "Regular order!") I insist that this appeal must be entertained, and that we must know whether this is a case that has gone to the Commission, or whether it is now to be considered by the separate Houses. This is not a dilatory motion, but one that arises upon a vital provision of the electoral law; and I ask the Chair to entertain the appeal.

The Speaker. The Chair considers that he is bound by the law —

Mr. Springer. I want the law enforced.

The Speaker. And the law is as plain as the day.

Mr. Springer. If this case under the law has gone to the Commission, it is there now by the operation of the law and we have nothing before us.

The Speaker. This House has it within its power by a majority vote to call from the Senate that paper.

Mr. Caulfield, Mr. O'Brien, and others. When?

The Speaker. Surely, gentlemen will not say that the Chair has that power.

Mr. Walling. But we ask for a vote first on calling that paper from the Senate.

Mr. O'Brien. We want that question decided now, whether we have the right to send to the Senate for that certificate.

Mr. Beebe (who addressed the Chair amid cries of "Order!" and great confusion) was understood to say, Mr. Speaker, I have stood with the majority of this House against every proposition to delay obedience to this law. I acknowledge my obligations under that law. I recognize the further fact that we are here not only under that, but in the exercise of every prerogative and privilege guaranteed by the Constitution to this House. (Cries of "Order!" mingled with applause.) Will the Chair entertain the motion —

The Speaker. The Chair will entertain no motion.

Mr. Beebe. Then I charge the Speaker with doing what I have complained of the Electoral Commission for doing, violating the very law under which we are operating.

Mr. Rice. The Speaker is usurping power.

The Speaker. The Chair usurps no power.

Mr. Beebe. Ninety members of this House

demand that appeal from the decision of the Chair, and it cannot be had.

Mr. Mills. I hope that usurpation is not becoming so incapacitating as to cause usurpation of power over members of this House.

The Speaker. The Chair neither usurps, nor does he permit oppression upon the Chair. (Applause upon the floor and in the galleries.)

Mr. Beebe. Will the Chair state the reason for this ruling?

The Speaker. The Chair decides according to his conscience and the law.

Mr. Beebe. Will the Chair state the reason for this ruling?

Mr. Wells, of Mississippi. I ask whether—

(Here there was great confusion in the Hall, members rising and standing.)

Mr. Beebe (standing on top of one of the desks). I demand to know the reason why the Chair refuses to state his reasons for refusing to hear an appeal. (Applause.) With all respect to the Chair, I ask him to state the reason of this ruling.

Mr. Springer. I demand that the galleries be cleared.

Mr. Beebe. From my place in this House I now under the rules ask the Speaker of this House respectfully to state the reason for his

refusal to entertain the motion which I make.

The Speaker. The Chair gave his reasons at length on a similar proposition yesterday.

Mr. Caulfield. We have no recollection of any such proposition having been made.

Several Members. It never has been.

Mr. Jones, of Kentucky. If the Chair ruled that way yesterday, he must have ruled wrongly.

Mr. Franklin. We demand that the appeal from the decision of the Chair be placed before the House.

Mr. Springer. Mr. Speaker, I move this House now take a recess until to-morrow at ten o'clock.

Mr. Beebe. I claim that I have some rights upon this floor. I claim that courtesy from the Chair that I always have cheerfully rendered to him.

The Speaker. The Chair will proceed with the public business.

Mr. Brown, of Kentucky. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the officers of this House enforce order.

Mr. Money. Let them try it.

Mr. Brown, of Kentucky. They can do it.

Mr. Sparks. Let them try it.

Mr. Brown, of Kentucky. I demand that they enforce order upon you and all others who

are out of order. If I were an officer of the House I would try it. (Applause.)

The Speaker. The Chair is determined that gentlemen shall take their seats. The Chair is not going to submit longer to this disorder. (Loud applause on the floor and in the galleries.) If gentlemen forget themselves, it is the duty of the Chair to remind them that they are members of the American Congress. (Renewed applause on the floor and in the galleries.)

Mr. Glover. I appeal to members of this House —

Mr. Sparks. The Chair is simply the Speaker of this House of Representatives. We are the representatives of the people. (Applause.)

Mr. Beebe. I respectfully ask —

Mr. Sparks. Look at these lobbies, Mr. Speaker. I have tried to get the Speaker's ear so that I could direct attention to them. We are mobbed by the lobby! Here is the rule (holding up the Manual), and we ask the Chair to enforce it. (Applause.)

Mr. Brown, of Kentucky. It is not the lobby, sir.

Several Members. It is.

Mr. Brown, of Kentucky. The lobby would be ashamed of it. (Applause.)

Mr. Sparks. So, too, the American people are ashamed of the action of members, some, too, claiming to be Democrats. (Applause.)

Mr. Glover. I appeal to every member of this House to try to contribute something to its order and its respectability. The time must come when we must have order in this House, and it is the duty of every member now to give aid to restore order in this House.

The Speaker. The Chair desires every gentleman who is not a member of this Congress to retire.

Mr. Cox. I call for the reading of the one hundred and thirty-fourth rule, and its enforcement promptly.

Mr. Sheakley. I ask for the reading of the rule.

The Speaker. The Chair orders that the spaces behind the members' desks on both sides of the House shall be cleared. That he has the right to do, and it is in the interest of good order.

Mr. Cox. I have the right to have read the one hundred and thirty-fourth rule. I desire to say, with all respect to the Chair, that the rule should be enforced in the cloak-room as well as on the floor.

Mr. Burchard, of Illinois. On that side of the House.

Mr. Cox. On both sides of the House.

Mr. Watterson. In the cloak-room as well as on the floor.

The Speaker. The Sergeant-at-arms is discharging his duty in that connection, as the Chair understands.

To have an adequate conception of this scene of painful disorder, one must multiply this report by three or four. No system of reporting, no corps of reporters, was adequate to such an occasion. An account of it, which was published in the "New York Tribune" of the following day, does not seem to me to be greatly exaggerated. The writer says: "The whole" body of obstructionists "now rose to their feet and inaugurated such a scene of disorder as has probably never been witnessed in the stormiest scenes of Congress before. At least twenty were shouting and gesticulating together, and this number soon included the whole force of the revolutionists. * * * After about ten minutes of disorder, which cannot be described, the Speaker sent the Sergent-at-Arms among the desks on the Democratic side, and compelled the members to sit down. * * * His manner rose to the occasion. He reminded those on the floor that they were members of

the American Congress, and declared that the Chair was resolute, and would tolerate no more disorder."

The House now discovered that it had a master. Business began to move in its proper channels. The Houses met once more in joint session. South Carolina was counted, Tennessee, Texas; Vermont, after a contest; Virginia, West Virginia; Wisconsin, after another, but brief contest; and thus the roll of the States was completed. Then, at four o'clock and ten minutes, on the morning of March 2, 1877, the President of the joint convention declared that Rutherford B. Hayes, having received a majority of all the electoral votes, was duly elected President of the United States. In announcing the result the presiding officer said, "The Chair trusts that all present, whether on the floor or in the galleries, will refrain from all demonstrations whatever; that nothing shall occur on this occasion to mar the dignity and moderation which have characterized these proceedings, in the main so reputable to the American people and worthy of the respect of the world." The announcement was received by all parties with respectful silence and apparent submission. The pent-up feeling of dissatisfaction found vent through inflammatory

articles in the press and much private grumbling. There was even some wild talk of a forcible attempt to prevent the inauguration; but if there was ever any serious purpose of that kind, it was extinguished by the thought that a great soldier was sitting silent but watchful in the presidential chair.

Two or three things are suggested by this narrative which it may be well to notice.

In the first place, we can now understand why no reliable history of the electoral count of 1877 has been written. Who was there to write such a history? This nation is made up mostly of Democrats and Republicans. For certain good reasons, none of the writers of either of these parties have wished to give us a history of the count. They have instinctively felt that any history which should be written ought to be in accord with the general approval which now exists in the public mind of the great measure by which the count was conducted. Democrats are not ready to express such approval, because the count resulted in the defeat of their candidate; and Republicans have felt a natural diffidence about commending a measure against which a large majority of them voted. This is why no leading man of either party has attempted

to give us a complete account of the event.

Again, we see how absurd has been the statement that there was fraud in the count, that somebody was cheated by the manner in which it was conducted. The simple narrative of facts which has now been given refutes such a charge. If anybody was cheated, who was it? Certainly not the Republicans; for their candidate was made President. Nor was it the Democrats; for the bill in accordance with which the electoral votes were ascertained and declared was specially their measure. A majority of the votes cast for it in both Houses were Democratic. In the Senate but one Democrat voted against it; and in the House but eighteen. The number of Democratic votes which it received in the House was so large that the bill would have passed if every Republican had voted against it. It was opposed by more than two-thirds of the Republicans in the House, and when it was under discussion, Democrats reproached us for our want of patriotism and broad statesmanship in not supporting it; and there was some truth in the charge. If it was wrong to leave questions to a commission, it was a Democratic wrong. If the mode of choosing the commissioners in the House and Senate was a blunder, it was a

Democratic blunder. If it was a violation of a previous good understanding with the Democrats that Judge Davis should resign his place on the bench and be elected Senator from Illinois, it was a violation which was not committed by Republicans, but by Judge Davis himself, who resigned, and by the Democrats of Illinois, who elected him, in spite of the Republicans of Illinois, who did their best to defeat him. If there was unfairness in the choice of Judge Bradley for the fifteenth commissioner, it was unfairness for which 180 Democrats in the two Houses had provided, and which two Democratic judges united with two Republican judges in consummating. In a word, if there was fraud anywhere in the measure, it was the work of an immense majority of the Democrats in both Houses of Congress.

Once more, the amicable adjustment of the serious difficulties of 1876 and 1877 by means of legislation, and the fidelity to principle shown in the peaceable submission to the result by both parties—although it was so disappointing to one of them—and by the whole country, afford new and solid grounds of confidence in the stability of our institutions. Such a happy issue out of our perils makes the foundations of government seem firmer under our

feet. The capacity for self-control exhibited by the nation under the great excitement of the contest was a strong guarantee of a well-ordered and prosperous future. It showed the deep attachment of our people to law rather than revolution as a means of settling differences. It showed, as I trust, that an impassable gulf separates our methods and policies from those of the Spanish States of this continent; that Americans are indeed a branch of that great Teutonic race who know how to make homes and build States, and how to defend and preserve them. It has enabled us to feel that we could approach another dangerous crisis in our affairs with less trepidation as to the result. It has increased our just pride in the common country. It is a noble precedent, and one which will be quoted in all time to furnish motives for self-restraint in heated party contests, to give added strength to the reasonings of statesmen, and new force to the appeals of patriots. It will forever remain a conspicuous example of that moderation and love of settled order which are essential to the perpetuity of the Republic.

LEADING SPEAKERS IN CONGRESS FROM 1871 TO 1881.

A THURSDAY LECTURE.

I HAVE thought that any man of average ability and education who would set himself to write out, as accurately as he could, just his own impression of the men whom he had known, and especially of men in any way remarkable, must produce a work of some value. He would, no doubt, labor under some disadvantages. Truth is not at all times and to all minds as interesting as error. He who would write with conscientious accuracy must question, and sometimes reject, extreme statements, and extreme statements are often spirited and lively. He must introduce prosy qualifications, which, like dams on a stream, retard the flow of the narrative. He must free himself from party bias, and substitute judicial coolness for the warmth and color with which party bias deals. He must see faults in his friends and good

qualities in his enemies; and this diminishes the ardor of composition. It seems a shame that one's enemies should have good qualities, but they will sometimes have them, and then they must be recognized. He must check an attractive but misleading vivacity of style, and must be willing to sacrifice even a trenchant antithesis or a brilliant metaphor rather than do injustice to his fellow-men. To many all this will make him seem dull. But he can afford to make the sacrifice; and from you and me, who wish to know men and things as they are, he shall have only sympathy and approval.

It has been in the spirit of these remarks that I have endeavored to treat the subject for the occasion, which is the Leading Speakers of the Congress of the United States, and especially of the House of Representatives, whom I knew and heard during the ten years from 1871 to 1881.

I found the prominent speakers in Congress to be of very different types; and to consider them as belonging to these types will be the more intelligible and satisfactory method. If we view them from this standpoint, we shall readily form an appreciative estimate of the power which they possessed without doing the injustice of demanding of them some form of

merit which was foreign to their nature and endowments. Keeping in mind, then, the differences in type among Congressional speakers, I shall ask your attention to some of the strongest and best of the men who were representatives of their respective classes.

The first type of Congressional speaking which I would name is that of the *orator*. This word I use in a sense perhaps somewhat special to this occasion. By the orator I mean the speaker who produces the strongest present effect. He stirs the sensibility and touches the springs of action. He carries his hearers with him. He comes upon them like waters that have burst their barrier. He may not be specially deficient in other great qualities, but the noticeable thing about him is that sort of rhetorical force which moves men—which makes them of one mind, and that mind the mind of the speaker.

The most remarkable man of this class, in my time, was James G. Blaine. He could impress himself more strongly upon the House of Representatives in sixty minutes—could make more members feel like doing what he wanted done—than any other man. This was a native, spontaneous quality. It showed itself in private conversation. If he joined you on the street, and began setting forth some favorite

plan of legislation, you soon found his enthusiasm contagious. Your bark had struck a current, and though sail and rudder might still do their part, the keel felt and thrilled to the new force.

The foundation elements of his power were two:—he saw clearly, and he willed strongly. He was quite determined that every man who heard him should go along with him, and to this determination every power of his being was committed. He had singular unity of purpose. He had but one thing to accomplish, and that stood out before his mind as sharply defined as the summit of Jungfrau against a June morning.

But the elements of his power should be considered more in detail. In the first place, he had great general knowledge. He knew something of almost everything, and of some things he knew a great deal. This quality showed itself whenever he spoke at length, in great wealth of reference and illustration. Again, he had a strong, clear style. This is found in his writings as well as in his speeches. He has no use for an obscure sentence, or a weak, worn-out, or superfluous phrase.

There was another very noticeable quality in Mr. Blaine's speaking. It had about it an air

of business. This was a quality both of his thought and of his style. There was something important which must be done and done promptly. The speaker seemed hurried—not in the sense of being confused or losing sight of his plan or any detail of his plan, but in the sense of having on hand much responsible and pressing work. He could not wait, and you must come. You soon felt that you must have part in the enterprise. Not only were inattention and indifference out of the question, but inaction would be discreditable. You could not let a strong and noble spirit grapple with great difficulties unaided. You perhaps had been absent from the House an hour, some day, and when you returned, Blaine was upon his feet. If you were a new member, and had not witnessed the scene before, it struck you that something unusual must have happened. The fervid, impetuous speaker, the bugle call that sounded through his voice, the members that with one accord have stopped the writing and talking at their desks, and are listening with rapt attention, and some of whom have started up and stepped forward with solicitous and expectant faces—what does all this mean? Has news arrived of complications with some foreign power? Or has rebellion broken out in

some distant State? You ask a member standing near what it is all about. He is too intent upon the turn in the current sentence to hear you. You are growing anxious. You try to ascertain for yourself where in the broad domain of politics the speaker is. But you were not here when he began, and he has a long start of you. It will take you some time to catch up. You put phrases together and draw inferences, but your mind is not entirely relieved of its anxiety for the public weal, until you perhaps discover that there is nothing more alarming in the speech than an old-fashioned arraignment of the Democratic Party for its sins during the war—such an arraignment, it strikes you, as you yourself have made upon the stump; *such* an arraignment, and yet how different! Why could not you have said it *so?* Could you have spoken thus, what troops of followers you might have had! In all Mr. Blaine's better efforts there was a note of preparation which at once fixed attention. He seemed to be getting ready for some great occasion, and his hearers were summoned to be in readiness with him. He was rallying all his forces, and you felt that you must be at the mustering in. There was great attractiveness in this business-like manner, and it did not disappoint you.

All the speaker's preparation and all his resources were made effective to a worthy end.

It no doubt added to Mr. Blaine's weight and influence as an orator that he was so eminently fair in debate. He was a magnanimous enemy. He had no thought of treating an opponent otherwise than as an equal. He observed, without grudging, all the forms of parliamentary courtesy. Credit was heartily given to his antagonist for all merit, whether of intellect or character. He quoted frankly and fairly. He yielded readily for explanations and corrections. He promptly qualified, when his attention was called to it, any remark which had seemed to reflect upon the motives of others. His methods were open and manly. He used no "twitting and flinging." He had too much confidence in the strength of his cause to deem it necessary to resort to expedients not natural to him, and was, doubtless, often too much absorbed in his subject to think of them. No doubt he often looked for the weak spot in his adversary's armor—and it was not always comfortable for his adversary to find him doing it; but it was the logical armor and not the personal that he would strike through. Malice never, and contempt rarely, were expressed in his speeches. He used only legitimate weapons

—weapons approved by the rules of civilized warfare. He shot no poisoned arrows. There were no discharges of broken glass or rusty nails. He never condescended to the horsewhip or the popgun. It might be said of him as Scott says of young Lochinvar,

> And save his good broadsword he weapon had none.

Nor did he need any other. No antagonist ever thought of him as not sufficiently armed. He was quite content to trust to the force of his blows and the temper of his steel to give him the victory. The generous tone of feeling which he exhibited had the effect to win sympathy for his efforts, increase the satisfaction of his friends in his successes, and diminish to his enemies the bitterness of defeat.

Their full effect was given to the qualities that have been named by an abounding courage which had its root in the ardor of his nature, which never failed, and which rose with the occasion however much the occasion required. When battle offered, he was not only ready for it, but engaged in it with alacrity, especially if he could meet foemen "worthy of his steel."

It should be added that the intellectual and moral forces of the orator found expression

through a physical medium which was worthy of them. His tall, erect, strongly built, and commanding person; his sonorous and sympathetic voice; his not frequent but powerful gestures; his simple, unaffected, and vigorous declamation—these endowments were sufficient of themselves to have given distinction to a man of half his ability.

Such were some of the causes of Mr. Blaine's power as an orator. But they seem to account for it very imperfectly. They were only phenomena of another cause lying back of them all—the true explanation of his power over men—his unique and wonderful personality.

To present the whole matter briefly, while Mr. Blaine's speeches contained much strong thought and much sound argument—enough strong thought and sound argument, perhaps, to have made the reputation of another man—yet his forte was not that of a close reasoner, nor of a debater in the sense in which I shall use that term. He was impatient of the ordinary processes of reasoning. He commonly reached the right conclusion, but by short and swift methods. He excelled all his associates in power of statement. The impassioned faith with which his propositions were poured forth commended them to his hearers, and generally

secured their assent. As Daniel Webster in his debate with Hayne said of Samuel Dexter: "His very statement was argument; his inference seemed demonstration. * * * One was convinced and believed and assented, because it was gratifying, delightful to think and feel and believe in unison with an intellect of such evident superiority." The arguments of his opponent Mr. Blaine seldom attempted to refute in detail. He assailed and broke down his principal proposition, and then dismissed him. He felt that if he could carry the enemy's center all his lines would fall into confusion. In a word, he was not so much a logician or a debater as an orator.

You will expect me to present a few illustrations of the peculiar power which I have ascribed to Mr. Blaine.

One of the occasions when I was most strongly impressed by his speaking was the discussion in the first session of the Forty-fourth Congress upon the bill for general amnesty. This bill had been introduced by Mr. Randall in December, 1875, and the discussion occurred in the following month. Mr. Blaine, who had always been favorable to amnesty, offered to support the bill, if an amendment could be adopted excepting a single name from its

operation—the name of Jefferson Davis. This exception he demanded not on the ground that Mr. Davis had been the great leader in the treason against the Government, but on the ground that he was responsible for the horrors of the Andersonville prison—a crime, he contended, which placed him outside the regards of civilized men. Great excitement followed, and the debate became one of the ablest, most brilliant, and most heated to which it was my fortune to listen. Were any cruelties inflicted upon our soldiers at Andersonville? If there were, was Mr. Davis responsible for them? And if he was, had it any logical connection with the subject of amnesty? These were some of the questions discussed. The debate continued a week, and during the whole time, wherever the battle was hottest Mr. Blaine was to be found. He spoke at length several times, and the condensed energy of some portions of his speeches makes them a profitable study. I quote a few sentences:—

"Sir, since the gentleman from Pennsylvania introduced this bill, last month, I have taken occasion to reread some of the historic cruelties of the world. I have read over the details of those atrocious murders of the Duke of Alva in the Low Countries, which are always

mentioned with a thrill of horror throughout Christendom. I have read the details of the massacre of St. Bartholomew that stand out in history as one of those atrocities beyond imagination. I have read anew the horrors, untold and unimaginable, of the Spanish Inquisition. And I here, before God, measuring my words, knowing their full extent and import, declare that neither the deeds of the Duke of Alva in the Low Countries, nor the massacre of Saint Bartholomew, nor the thumb-screws and engines of torture of the Spanish Inquisition, begin to compare in atrocity with the hideous crime of Andersonville. * * * But I will undertake to say this, and, as it may be considered an extreme speech, I want to say it with great deliberation, that there is not a government, a civilized government on the face of the entire globe—I am very sure there is not a European government—that would not have arrested Mr. Davis, and when they had him in their power, would not have tried him for maltreatment of the prisoners of war, and shot him within thirty days. France, Russia, England, Germany, any one of them would have done it. The poor victim Wirz deserved his death for brutal treatment and murder of many victims, but I always thought it was a weak movement on the part

of our Government to allow Jefferson Davis to go at large and hang Wirz. I confess I do. Wirz was nothing in the world but a mere subordinate, a tool, and there was no special reason for singling him out for death. I do not say he did not deserve it—he did richly, amply, fully. He deserved no mercy, but, at the same time, as I have often said, it seemed like skipping over the president, superintendent, and board of directors in the case of a great railroad accident and hanging the brakeman of the rear car. * * * I hear it said, 'We shall lift Mr. Davis into great consequence by refusing amnesty.' That is not for me to consider. I only see before me, when his name is presented, a man who by a wink of his eye, by a wave of his hand, by a nod of his head, could have stopped the atrocity at Andersonville. Some of us had kinsmen there, most of us had friends there, all of us had countrymen there, and in the name of these kinsmen, friends, and countrymen, I here protest and shall with my vote protest, against their calling back and crowning with the honors of full American citizenship, the man who organized that murder."

The amnesty bill was defeated. Mr. Blaine and those who sympathized with him refused

to vote for it unless Jefferson Davis was excepted from its provisions; and its friends refused to accept amnesty for anybody else unless it could be granted to him. Thus the bill failed to receive the requisite majority.

It is not my purpose to express any opinion, on this occasion, in regard to the merits of what were known as the Mulligan letters; but the object of this address would be imperfectly accomplished, should I fail to notice the effect of Mr. Blaine's speech when he read those letters to the House. The common impression would, perhaps, be that Mr. Blaine must have appeared, at that time, like a man on the defensive—that his manner must have been apologetic and deprecatory. The truth however is just the opposite of this. There was no abatement in his old pride of bearing—no indication that he had lost anything of his sense of self-respect or of the respect due him from others. His manner throughout an extended speech was not so much that of one who is called to give account of improper conduct as one who is calling others to account for having charged him with such conduct. As Macaulay says of Warren Hastings, "He appeared like a great and not like a bad man." Few men have ever delivered a speech that produced a stronger

present impression. The frank presentation of the letters to the House, after so many prophecies that not one of them would ever be allowed to see the light, proved to be sufficient of itself to win and hold the attention of every hearer. The result of the effort undoubtedly was to bring the House, in large measure, into sympathy with the orator.

Mr. Blaine's principal antagonist was Proctor Knott, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which was conducting an investigation in which Mr. Blaine's reputation was supposed to be involved. At the close of his speech, Mr. Blaine turned to Mr. Knott and, with great vehemence, uttered a few words which produced a sensation in the House. I quote from the "Congressional Record":—

"*Mr. Blaine.* I heard you got a dispatch last Thursday morning, at 8 o'clock, from Josiah Caldwell, completely and absolutely exonerating me from this charge, and you have suppressed it. (Protracted applause upon the floor and in the galleries.) I want the gentleman to answer. (After a pause.) Does the gentleman from Kentucky decline to answer?" Mr. Knott did decline to answer for the present, and Mr. Blaine thereupon offered a resolution instructing the Judiciary Committee to report

forthwith this telegram to the House and the reasons why it had been suppressed. He closed by saying, "I call the previous question on that resolution," which again elicited protracted applause from the floor and galleries.

Some evidence of the powerful impression made by this speech, even upon the minds of Mr. Blaine's enemies, was furnished by an incident that occurred some time afterwards, as was stated to the House by Mr. Frye of Maine. Friends of Mr. Knott approached Mr. Frye, a friend and colleague of Mr. Blaine, and like Mr. Knott a member of the Judiciary Committee, and requested that he would agree to a report from that Committee exonerating Mr. Knott from blame in suppressing the cable dispatch, giving as a reason for asking this favor that Mr. Knott "desired exculpation because he had received unfriendly looks and unfriendly criticisms from his own side of the House."

In justice to Mr. Knott, who was regarded by those who knew him as a fair-minded man, it should be added that, when he took the floor, he offered as his defense for withholding the telegram that—to use his own phrase—he "had a suspicion that it was a fixed-up job," and wished to retain it for further examination.

I have not time to introduce many examples

of the power of the orator, but I cannot leave the subject without adding that Mr. Frye of Maine, now Senator Frye, and my colleague, John A. Bingham, were both largely endowed with the same class of gifts as those which made Mr. Blaine so distinguished a member of the House.

I next invite attention to the speaker as *teacher*. This is a recognized and influential type in our Congress.

The teacher is a kind of speaker who delights in the exhaustive treatment of his subject. When he has made a speech, nothing affords him greater satisfaction than to hear it reported that he has left nothing further to be said upon the theme. He introduces all the affirmative arguments, and replies to all the objections. He treats the subject in itself, and in its relations to other fields of thought. He is not insensible to present effect and to the importance of votes, but these do not tempt him to neglect the producing of a symmetrical, complete, systematic exposition of his theme. He explains those parts of the subject which have been imperfectly understood. Those aspects of it which have been exposed to prejudice, he sets in a more favorable light. He makes allowance for the opposition of opponents, and can

understand why persons with such surroundings as theirs should have fallen into error. This mode of speaking is likely to make converts in case of any question which is not decidedly partisan. What will make converts, in case of questions which are of that character, I have never yet ascertained. The members of the House like to have at least one such speaker as I have described. When he is to address them, they gather about and listen. They expect a speech that will be an authority on the subject discussed. They crowd around the speaker, and congratulate him when he concludes. They read his speech carefully when printed, subscribe for many copies, and send them to their friends. Such a speech becomes widely circulated in the press and is often quoted. If the teacher adds to the endowments already mentioned good qualities of style and delivery—if he be an accomplished rhetorician—he will achieve a position of great prominence. He will have a large following, may be promoted in due time from the House to the Senate, and may even become President of the United States. Such a man was James A. Garfield.

General Garfield's thoroughness of preparation, when a great subject was to be discussed,

was very noticeable. Whatever time was necessary to this end he did not hesitate to take. He availed himself of a wide range of reading. If the business of the House was unimportant or uninteresting, he would be absent from his seat. At such a time, it was safe to say to an inquirer that he was in the Congressional Library. Mr. Spofford, the Librarian, told us that he made more use of the books of this library than any other member of Congress. He also knew how to make his friends useful on such occasions. He made no secret of what he was doing. He accepted thankfully from others suggestions, facts, references, the verification of quotations. He was anxious that nothing should be omitted that was necessary to the completeness of his speech. Yet few men were more truly original in the plan and the general treatment of a subject. Food, from whatever source it may be furnished, is not more really converted by digestion into nourishment for the individual body than were the contributions which he received made subservient to an original individual purpose. The result of his preparation was that he brought out speeches of great and lasting value. His addresses upon such questions as the Census, Banking and Currency, Specie Resumption, and Revenue and

Expenditure, are still treasuries of facts and arguments for all who wish to master these themes. He was indeed the great teacher of Congress and the nation. His fondness for exhaustive treatment was so great that he not infrequently introduced into his speeches matter not wholly pertinent to the business in hand. But this did not much disturb either him or his audience. He spoke not only for the hour but for the century, not only to the House but to the nation.

He was not so anxious to produce present effect as to realize some ideal treatment of his theme. His whole manner was in accord with this idea. His speeches consisted, for the most part, of a succession of thoughtful, clean-cut sentences of about equal interest throughout. Commonly there was nearly as much warmth of emotion in the beginning as in the middle or the end. As you listened you missed that growth of feeling, that kindling passion to which you were accustomed in the great orators, and which seemed to be reasonably expected in an assembly essentially popular and called to daily action. His speeches were chargeable with monotony— a monotony of excellent thoughts suitably expressed. The endless variety, the constant surprises, the

impassioned climax which characterized the orations of Mr. Blaine were wanting in the discourses of General Garfield. All these things marked him as a teacher rather than orator.

General Garfield was not a great debater. Debate was not the sort of speaking that he affected. He could do good work of that kind when it was necessary, but he preferred to be excused from it. I have expressed this judgment with some diffidence, because it would seem to be contrary to the received opinion. The leading journals have spoken of him as a great debater, and a distinguished Senator was once quoted to me with approval by Vice-President Wheeler as saying that General Garfield was the greatest debater in the Congress of the United States. But all this can only mean that he was a very great speaker, as he certainly was. It comes from an inaccurate definition of the word debater. I never knew a man attain high excellence of this kind, who had not some natural love, in the rhetorical sense, of personal conflict,—a quality which General Garfield evidently lacked. Sharply controverted points he avoided when he could, and such points, no doubt, were often small ones. Perhaps no man ever spoke so much in Congress with so little personal collision. I said to him once, "They

complain of you because you don't assault the Democrats." He replied, "Somehow I never could learn to do nagging." He delighted in impersonal discourse, and there can be little impersonal discourse to the true debater. He preferred to discuss a subject upon its broad merits without regard to the question whether others agreed with him or not. He seldom made personal references to those who differed from him. Most of what was said against him he left unnoticed. His idea seemed to be that the arguments of his opponents would all naturally be answered in the course of his own speech without further specification.

It follows that General Garfield was not what was called in the House an aggressive speaker. His personal courage was beyond question. This had been shown both on the battle-field and in public life. But he was an amiable man, and his amiability—indeed his very candor and fairness—imposed limitations upon his aggressiveness. He could fight a good fight, and sometimes did so, if it was necessary. But his common thought was, why should it be necessary? Why should he stand up to apply harsh epithets to those who were opposed to him? He dreaded the blows he must give quite as much as the blows he must take. The few

occasions on which he felt constrained to make a personal attack were followed by misgivings. He was afraid that he might have gone too far. He would sometimes say to an opponent after a contest was over, "Well, I trust I did not treat you unfairly." All this made him lovable, and was intrinsically the better way, but in so stormy an assembly as the House of Representatives it sometimes diminished the power of his party leadership.

A single incident may illustrate what I have said. During the third session of the Forty-fifth Congress, the Democrats of the House held a caucus at which a course was agreed upon to be pursued in the House in order to accomplish the repeal of certain Republican legislation avowedly intended to secure freedom and purity of elections in the South. On a subsequent day, when the House was in Committee of the Whole, and when Mr. Blackburn, of Kentucky, a leading Democrat who had been president of the caucus, was acting as chairman of the committee, General Garfield obtained the floor and said that he had not spoken upon the questions under discussion because he did not choose to take part in a moot debate—that ordinarily the House was a deliberative body, but to-day it had met merely to register the

edict of a party caucus, and that it was presided over by one who was under orders to conform his rulings to a certain policy. Mr. Blackburn asked another member to take the chair, came down upon the floor, and, in an imperious manner, demanded of General Garfield an explanation of his words, adding that, if the General should stand by them, his answer would be as plain and emphatic as it would be short. Mr. Blackburn's manner seemed so defiant, that many Republicans greatly wished that General Garfield should merely reply that his words had doubtless been taken down accurately by the reporter, that he was not aware of any obscurity in them, and that Mr. Blackburn was at liberty to examine them at his leisure. But General Garfield did what was, no doubt, better than this. He felt that his words had been rhetorical rather than strictly accurate. There was no evidence that any literal orders had been given to Mr. Blackburn, and so he said that he had intended no personal reflection upon the gentleman from Kentucky, that he had only meant that the whole Democratic party in the House, including Mr. Blackburn, had been under a sort of "moral duress" from the caucus action which had prevented their acting freely in the House,

and thus had robbed it of its deliberative character. Mr. Blackburn graciously accepted this explanation, and we had peace. Some Republicans complained that General Garfield had shown a want of proper spirit, but it is now evident that, if he made a mistake, it was in using the words in the first place, and not in qualifying them afterwards.

It is hardly necessary to add in this presence that General Garfield had a good English style—a style characterized by simplicity, clearness, and strength. He was sparing in the use of ornament. He was more intent in putting you in possession of his thought than in having it said that there was grace in his way of doing it. Yet there are passages where the mere wealth and fullness of thought rise, without conscious effort, to a chastened beauty which is more agreeable to a refined taste than more elaborate adornments—just as the fainter scent of the new mown clover affords more pleasure than the concentrated sweets of the perfumer, or, as we prefer the perfume of roses to that of ottar of rose.

General Garfield is not a very quotable writer. In his speeches the connection is close and the merit remarkably uniform. In an address an hour in length you will find scarcely

one feeble sentence and not many sentences which rise to the higher plane of feeling. Detached paragraphs are therefore likely to do him injustice, to give an inadequate idea of his strength. I will venture, however, to quote a few of the more vivacious passages from his speech in the House on the Constitutional Amendment for the Abolition of Slavery:—

"We shall never know why slavery dies so hard in this republic and in this hall till we know why sin has such longevity and Satan is immortal. With marvelous tenacity of existence, it has outlived the expectations of its friends and the hopes of its enemies. It has been declared here and elsewhere to be in all the several stages of mortality—wounded, dying, dead. * * * I know of no better illustration of its condition than is found in Sallust's admirable history of the great conspirator Catiline, who, when his final battle was fought and lost, his army broken and scattered, was found far in advance of his own troops, lying among the dead enemies of Rome, yet breathing a little, but exhibiting in his countenance all that ferocity of spirit which had characterized his life. So, sir, this body of slavery lies before us among the dead enemies of the republic, mortally wounded, impotent in its

fiendish wickedness, but with its old ferocity of look, bearing the unmistakable marks of its infernal origin. * * * On the justice of the amendment itself no arguments are necessary. The reasons crowd in on every side. To enumerate them would be a work of superfluity. To me it is a matter of great surprise that gentlemen on the other side should wish to delay the death of slavery. I can only account for it on the ground of long-continued familiarity and friendship. I should be glad to hear them say of slavery, their beloved, as did the jealous Moor,

> Yet she must die, else she'll betray more men.

Has she not betrayed and slain men enough? Are they not strewn over a thousand battle-fields? Is not this Moloch already gorged with the bloody feast? Its best friends know that its final hour is fast approaching. The avenging gods are on its track. Their feet are not now, as of old, shod with wool, nor slow and stately stepping, but winged, like Mercury's, to bear the swift message of vengeance. No human power can avert the final catastrophe."

I was permitted to hear Senator Sumner only a few times, but when I did hear him, he impressed me, like Garfield, as belonging to the class of the teacher. He was not a debater,

nor was he, in the sense used here, an orator. He was a great essayist, and a marvelous rhetorician, and his hearers were accustomed to look to him in both these capacities, to be instructed in facts and principles rather than to be stirred to action.

I served in two Congresses with Governor McKinley. In both these, his thoroughly prepared and instructive addresses classed him with Garfield and Sumner as a teacher in Congress, as he has since become, in the highest degree, a teacher of the whole people.

In one Congress, I had the privilege of hearing Ellis H. Roberts of New York. Deservedly, he might be placed in the same class—that of the teacher.

The next type of Congressional speaker that claims our attention is the *debater*. Debate means intellectual conflict—conflict not only with ideas but with men. It demands argumentative power, some taste for personal controversy, familiarity with the subject, self-control, quickness. The genuine debater, while he should be thoroughly informed, and should have established convictions upon questions before the House, has not much use for set speeches. These would often be an encumbrance rather than a help. He must be pre-

pared to do just as much or just as little speaking each day, as the state of business requires. He must be always ready, must never be taken by surprise, must lose no opportunity. On account of the tendency to deliver, print, and circulate prepared speeches, our Congress does not furnish a very favorable school for the training of debaters. But in spite of this disadvantage, some great debaters have been produced in our national legislature. I used to think the best debater in the House of Representatives was John A. Kasson, of Iowa. He made no attempt to deliver great speeches; but was always prepared to aid in discussing, analyzing, and sifting the questions before the House. If there were good reasons for a proposition, he knew of them; if there were objections, he did not overlook them. It was not his habit when an opponent had delivered an elaborate speech, to ask the House to adjourn to give him an opportunity to prepare a reply. He replied, on the spot, in clear, neat, and vigorous English, pursuing his antagonist from point to point, refuting all his arguments so thoroughly, that at the conclusion there seemed to be nothing left of the hostile speech.

Benjamin H. Hill of Georgia was also a great debater. He was put forward by his

party to make the principal effort in reply to Mr. Blaine in the amnesty debate. His speech was a great one, and would have made deeper impression but for certain awkward inconsistencies in his record. The moderate and reasonable opinions which he expressed in the House appeared to be contradicted by addresses which he had made upon the stump in his own State, and which had been published in the papers there. Some helpful person had sent copies of these to Mr. Blaine, who did not fail to call attention to them, as much to the amusement of members as to the embarrassment of his antagonist. As I made quotations from Mr. Blaine's speech, I will reproduce some paragraphs from that of Mr. Hill. They are, in themselves, a noble appeal to our sympathy and are worthy of notice as representing the tone of feeling maintained by the more reasonable class of Southern men in Congress.

"Sir, war is always horrible; war always brings hardships; it brings death, it brings sorrow, it brings ruin, it brings devastation. And he is unworthy to be called a statesman looking to the pacification of this country, who will parade the horrors inseparable from war for the purpose of keeping up the strife that produced the war.

"I do not doubt that I am the bearer of unwelcome messages to the gentleman from Maine and his party. He says that there are Confederates in this body, and that they are going to combine with a few from the North for the purpose of controlling this government. If one were to listen to the gentlemen on the other side, he would be in doubt whether they rejoiced more when the South left the Union, or regretted most when the South came back to the Union that their fathers helped to form, and to which they will forever hereafter contribute as much of patriotic ardor, of noble devotion, and of willing sacrifice as the constituents of the gentleman from Maine. O Mr. Speaker! why cannot gentlemen on the other side rise to the height of this great argument of patriotism? Is the bosom of the country always to be torn with this miserable sectional debate whenever a presidential election is pending? To that great debate of half a century before secession there were left no adjourned questions. The victory of the North was absolute, and God knows the submission of the South was complete. But, sir, we have recovered from the humiliation of defeat, and we come here among you, and we ask you to give us the greetings accorded to brothers by brothers. We propose

to join you in every patriotic endeavor, and to unite with you in every patriotic aspiration, that looks to the benefit, the advancement, the honor, of every part of our common country. Let us, gentlemen of all parties, in this centennial year indeed have a jubilee of freedom. We divide with you the glories of the Revolution and of the succeeding years of our national life before that unhappy division—that four years' night of gloom and despair—and so we shall divide with you the glories of all the future. * *

"Brave Union men of the North, followers of Webster and Fillmore, of Clay and Cass, and Douglas—you who fought for the Union for the sake of the Union, you who ceased to fight when the battle ended, and the sword was sheathed—we have no quarrel with you, whether Republicans or Democrats. We felt your heavy arm in the carnage of battle; but above the roar of the cannon we heard your voice of kindness, calling, 'Brothers, come back!' And we bear witness to you this day that that voice of kindness did more to thin the Confederate ranks and weaken the Confederate arm than did all the artillery employed in the struggle. We are here to coöperate with you; to do whatever we can, in spite of all our sorrows, to rebuild the Union; to restore peace; to

be a blessing to the country; and to make the American Union what our fathers intended it to be—the glory of America and a blessing to humanity."

It was remarkable quickness and power in debate, joined with parliamentary experience and knowledge of business, which made Mr. Hale, of Maine, now Senator Hale, so efficient a leader in the House. In the Forty-sixth Congress I met and heard Mr. Reed of Maine. In his speeches he already gave promise of being what he has since become—one of the most trenchant, pointed, and effective debaters whom the House has ever seen. Later, his brilliant history as Speaker of the House has made him universally known.

Mr. Hawley of Connecticut, since Senator from that State, Mr. Conger—afterwards Senator Conger—and Mr. Burrows, both of Michigan, and my colleague, Mr. Butterworth, had all, in different ways, marked excellence as debaters.

The *great lawyers* of Congress are perhaps entitled to a separate notice in this paper. They were, in some degree, at least, a distinct type of Congressional speakers. They were fastidious about phrases, strong in precedents and in rules of interpretation, and would some-

times make speeches so acute, so logical, and marked by such Euclidian neatness of demonstration that it was a positive pleasure to listen to them. The flavor of old masters and great authorities in their speeches was rather agreeable than otherwise, and if, at times, a mild contempt appeared for those who did not know the law, it was readily forgiven. Some of the great lawyers of the Senate were Judge Edmunds, Mr. Conkling, and Judge Thurman. Mr. Edmunds was not only a great lawyer, but had the courage of his convictions—a quality in lawyers, especially those who are looking to a seat on the bench, which is rising into higher esteem every day. Mr. Conkling, though not so great a lawyer as Judge Edmunds, was a greater orator, and could he but have freed himself, in larger measure, from self-consciousness, when addressing the Senate, it would have added to his weight and acceptableness. Judge Thurman had a high reputation as a sound constitutional lawyer. Among the great lawyers of the House were Rockwood Hoar and his brother George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, Mr. Lapham of New York, Mr. Carlisle of Kentucky, Mr. Shellabarger and Mr. Paine—later Senator Paine—both of Ohio, and Randolph Tucker of Virginia—all men of high character

and attainments. David Dudley Field was also, I suppose, a great lawyer, but he did not appear before the House so much in that character as in the rôle of a politician.

Two members of the House whose term of service was far too short for the public interest, employed a kind of speaking which I know not how better to designate than to call it *judicial*, so fairly did they seem able to weigh the arguments both for and against every proposition under discussion. I refer to General Cox of Ohio, and Professor Seelye of Massachusetts. With these gentlemen might be named, as of like spirit with them, that excellent man and excellent member of the House, William A. Wheeler of New York, afterwards Vice-President of the United States.

Several other types of speaking might be mentioned.

Mr. Dawes of Massachusetts, and Mr. Beck of Kentucky, who were both afterwards in the Senate, and who were commonly members of the Committee on Ways and Means or that on Appropriations, dealt much in figures and estimates, and might have been called the *business* leaders of the House. They were men of great usefulness, and always commanded attention whenever fiscal interests were under discussion.

Abram S. Hewitt of New York was a thoughtful and instructive speaker upon all questions of business. My colleague Charles Foster was a clear and useful speaker upon financial subjects. To this class of business speakers belonged Mr. Blount of Georgia, Mr. Atkins of Tennessee, and Mr. Farwell of Illinois, afterwards Senator from that commonwealth.

Were it not outside of my plan for the present occasion, and indeed impracticable, to devote much time to the Senate, it would be a pleasure to consider the merits of the great business leaders of that body, such as Mr. Morrill of Vermont, and our own distinguished Senator Sherman. But this attractive subject must be deferred for a future lecture.

The *wits* of the House were S. S. Cox of Ohio and New York, always; General Butler of Massachusetts, at times, and in the earlier part of his career, Proctor Knott of Kentucky. Mr. Cox was capable of making serious and even philanthropic speeches as well as witty ones. He did useful work in connection with the Life Saving Service and the Department of Indian Affairs. General Butler had merit as a lawyer, and Mr. Knott seemed to have profited early and wisely by a remark of Senator Corwin made not long before his death, that the great

mistake of his life had been to yield to the temptation to become a maker of funny speeches. R. G. Horr of Michigan, who generally engaged in the discussion of grave public questions, and who has since become widely known as a luminous writer upon the "New York Tribune," was, in the Forty-sixth Congress, found to be a match for any member in witty repartee.

There are many of my colleagues of whom I have not yet spoken, and to whom I cannot give as much time as I could wish and as their merits would justify. Mr. Parsons had fine gifts as a speaker—especially a certain *magnetic enthusiasm*. His friends thought that his term of service in the House was too brief to make his gifts properly felt there. Mr. Danford was heard with pleasure on account of a *candid and convincing clearness*. Mr. Keifer, afterwards speaker, had a *sustained force* which greatly impressed the House. The *ability and high character* of Judge Upson always secured for him a respectful hearing. Judge Lawrence commanded attention by his *legal learning* and *large knowledge of business*. Judge Ambler had a thorough acquaintance with our foreign affairs, and spoke with *energy and vivacity*. There were other members from Ohio of equal merit, but I must forbear.

Another class of speakers in the House—and the last to which I shall refer—might be designated as the *attractive declaimers*. Of this class were Mr. Voorhees of Indiana, Mr. Blackburn of Kentucky, Mr. Hooker of Mississippi, and General Banks of Massachusetts. They had sonorous and musical voices, and a fluency which nothing but the Speaker's gavel could arrest. They were not deficient in interesting and valuable thought, and this, set off as it was by a fine elocution, was sure to command the attention of the House, and both the attention and the applause of the galleries.

Further types of Congressional speaking might be discussed, but those I have named are the principal ones. It is matter of regret to me that the limits of this address compel me to omit the names of many really good speakers and useful members of the House.

The young people of my audience are now, perhaps, disposed to ask what is the practical relation of this discussion to their own attainments and future work. What does it mean for you? You will say that the men of whom I have spoken had special gifts, such extraordinary powers in certain directions as you cannot hope to emulate; and you inquire whether they had not some qualities in common—in

common with each other, and with all useful public speakers—which you might hope to reach. I reply that they had such qualities—qualities which were the common soil out of which grew all their gifts, and which must sustain the power of eloquence wherever it is possessed. Of two of these qualities I will speak.

In the first place, I noticed in all the distinguished men whose names I have introduced, a certain *scholarly* quality. By this I do not mean that they had mastered the amount of Latin and Greek usually prescribed in a college curriculum; though, as a matter of fact, they had generally done this. I do not mean that they had acquired more or less of science or philosophy or modern languages; though, doubtless, most of them had studied these branches of liberal culture. I do not mean that they were graduates from college, though it so happens that about three-fifths of them were. It was not until I had written thus far that I examined the record upon this point, and I then found that of the fifty-two men whose names I have used in illustration of my subject, thirty-two were graduates from reputable colleges and universities. But what I do mean more than any other one thing when I say that these men, almost without exception, had a

certain scholarly habit of mind, is that they were men who could not bear to think or speak in a confused or slovenly manner. Their thought must be clear, and they must give it clear expression. They must know what they wished to say, and say only that. They could take no satisfaction in an obscure or clumsy proposition. When I listened to the best thought of some of the best of these men, it seemed to lie in their minds like a diamond in the bottom of a spring, so clear was it in itself, and so clearly revealed. This scholarly quality is the fruit of much close and systematic thinking, of much weighing of thought and expression, of much self-discipline, of many mortifying discoveries of self-deficiencies, of much collision with other minds, whether in books, in society, or at school—collision which imparts polish, and sometimes strikes fire. This scholarly quality is within the reach of you all.

Another quality which I noticed in nearly all of these men was *earnestness* of character. They may not have been professors of religion, though I think most of them were. They were, at least, in earnest. They were no triflers. Life and its responsibilities and its rapidly approaching close were not to them a jest. There was unlimited work to be done, and but

little time to do it. Ennui and indifference had no place in their souls. They found the world interesting. Its burdens, its progress, its memories, its destinies, its fears, its hopes—all claimed their sympathy. Their hearts swelled and sometimes their eyes filled, when they discussed the welfare of a great empire which they and their hearers might do something to promote. There was some principle, some doctrine, some policy, some cause, which they loved better than life, and they made you feel it. They belonged to a generation that had momentous and terrible issues to meet. Some of them had exposed their lives for their country upon the battle-field. Some of them had had a share in the work of breaking the chains of the slave. Some of them had joined in unparliamentary but righteous applause on the floor of the House, in December, 1864, when that sentence was read from the message of Abraham Lincoln in which he declared, that if the people should, by whatever mode or means, make it an executive duty to re-enslave those that had been set free by the Proclamation of Emancipation, another and not he must be their instrument to perform it. Some of them had aided in framing the new amendments to the Constitution. Even those of them who had been on the

wrong side of the great issues had been terribly in earnest. Earnestness was the common quality of these men, and it showed itself not only in action, but in living thought expressed in words that burned.

This quality also may be yours. Earnestness is a quality of character, and character, even the highest, is, with God's help, of your own forming. The great issues are not all dead. New ones constantly arise. The groan of burdened humanity is still heard. Sin and oppression still make their desperate fight. The voice of God still calls. Even now the contest waxes warmer and comes nearer. Never was there a time when an earnest heart, a clear thought and a word that fits it, could do better work in the world than they can now.

JOSEPH AS A STATESMAN.

[Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1897.]

So general has been the interest, in our country, during the past few months, in the discussion of the merits of public men and public questions, from the standpoint of economic policy, that it may not be unsuitable to consider in this place, the *Bible* idea of what fits a man for responsible trust under government. And as the concrete is not only more attractive to most minds, than the abstract, but may even give us clearer views of abstract principles than we could attain without it, I have chosen for my subject, Joseph as a Statesman.

I. In developing this theme, let us consider, first, some of the qualities which Joseph had exhibited before he was chosen to be ruler over Egypt, and see whether they were such as to justify his appointment. Afterwards we will inquire how far our ideal of a statesman is met by the character and ability which he displayed

when actually in power as Pharaoh's prime minister.

1. To begin with the preparatory qualities, it is evident, in the first place, that he had been endowed by nature with remarkable talents for administration. He was a born organizer and manager. He was so made that wherever he went he must put things to rights. For disorder, unless they prevented him by force, he must substitute order; for embezzlement and fraud, uprightness and open dealing; for irresponsible recklessness, strict accountability; for bad and confused accounts, those good and methodical; for waste and extravagance, economy and thrift; for disobedience and eye-service, obedience and fidelity; for dull-eyed indolence, bright-eyed industry; and for all slatternly and dirty methods, those of cleanness and scrupulous care. When one of the Greek philosophers was taken prisoner in battle, and exposed for sale as a slave by the enemy in the market-place, he was asked what he could do. "Proclaim," he replied "that now there is an opportunity for one who would like to buy a master."

When Potiphar bought Joseph he bought a master—at least a great manager—without having it announced to him beforehand. When

Joseph came into his house he began taking charge of its interests, and every one gave place to him. Potiphar made him overseer over his house, and all that he had he put into his hand; and the blessing of the Lord was upon all that he had in the house and in the field. So perfect did his confidence in Joseph become, that it is said he left all that he had in Joseph's hand, and he knew not aught he had, save the bread which he did eat.

When Joseph was sent to prison on a false charge, this administrative ability was again displayed. So impressed by this was the keeper of the prison, that he soon committed all the prisoners to Joseph's hand, and whatsoever was done there, he was the doer of it. The keeper of the prison looked not to anything that was under his hand, because the Lord was with him, and that which he did the Lord made it prosper.

2. Again, when Joseph was called to power, he had already shown that he was a man of absolute fidelity to a trust.

When a mere boy of seventeen, he was placed by his father with his elder brothers in charge of the flock. He discovered evil conduct in these brothers, and reported it to his father. They highly disapproved of this course,

and hated him for it. A feeling like theirs, and, I suppose, for like reasons, exists to the present day. But Joseph reasoned that the family had common interests the proper management of which was essential to the common welfare; that his father, under God, had the supervision of these interests, and could make this supervision successful only by having full knowledge of the manner in which each member of the family was performing his part; that he himself had been intrusted by his father with a share of the common responsibility, and that, having discovered that his brothers had gone wrong, fidelity required that he should inform his father, so that, by timely admonition, the evil might be corrected. This duty he performed without regard to the consequences to himself. The needed admonition, though no doubt given, was disregarded. The brothers went from bad to worse, but the pitiful relations in which they were finally placed to their brother, abundantly vindicated his conduct.

When tempted and importuned to sin in Potiphar's house, and virtually threatened with some great calamity if he did not yield, his fidelity to his trust was again conspicuous. His master had intrusted him with all that he had; he would not betray him. God had bountifully

blessed him: he would be true to his God.

3. And this brings me to notice another quality which was characteristic of him from early youth; which was with him, as we have seen, in Potiphar's house; which shone forth when he was in prison; which was strong upon him when he was first brought into the presence of Pharaoh, and which was indeed the controlling force of his whole career and his whole life —and that was his constant recognition of his accountability to God. God was his sovereign, and he would obey him; his father, and he would love and serve him; his friend, and he would commune with him; his benefactor, and he would consecrate all to him. For God he felt a sweet and awful reverence, which sanctified every purpose of his heart. His mind had a habit of constant reference to God in all that he undertook. "I have heard," said Pharaoh, "that thou canst understand a dream to interpret it." Joseph replied, "It is not in me. God shall give Pharaoh an answer of peace." "God," he exclaimed at another time, "hath made me forget all my toil." To his brothers who bitterly remembered their past sin, he said, "Now therefore be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, that ye sold me hither; for God did send me before you, to preserve life." But the

whole history so abounds with these references to the Divine Providence, that justice cannot be done to it by a few brief quotations. "I fear God," was the declaration of Joseph to his brethren, and no quality is so well fitted as the fear of God to inspire and strengthen and elevate statesmanship. With what an added glory it gilds the name of such men as William of Orange and Hampden and Wilberforce and Gladstone! No quality, when sincerely cherished, will sooner win the sympathy of the people. Bismarck has said, on several occasions, that Germans fear nothing but God. Some German university, anxious, I suppose, to encourage this nascent sentiment in the Iron Chancellor, conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity, which he accepted with thanks. Let us hope that reverence for God may be a growing grace of his character.

4. I add that the character of Joseph appears to have been, from his youth, in all respects irreproachable. No charge that was true could be made against it. He seems to have been as nearly faultless as any mere man mentioned in sacred history. There was one occasion when, if anything could truly have been urged against him, it would certainly have been done; and that was when Pharaoh nom-

inated Joseph to his royal council to be, next to himself, chief ruler over Egypt. The proposal thus suddenly to advance a Hebrew slave, taken, perhaps, but an hour before from prison, over the heads of all the old nobility, to the premiership of the kingdom, would naturally excite a feeling of jealousy in the minds of the great lords of the court. It is noticeable that when Joseph, with no thought of the result as to himself, advised that some discreet and wise man should be set over the land in preparation for the approaching calamity, Pharaoh's councillors expressed their approval—the thing seemed good in the eyes of all his servants; but when he asked them what better man than Joseph could be selected for this purpose, they appear to have been silent—the record gives no account of any reply. I cannot resist the conviction that they had something of the feeling, though I hope not in so bitter and murderous a form, with which Haman learned, after having recommended a public triumph to the man whom the king delighted to honor, that Mordecai, and not himself, was the man—something of the feeling with which the princes of Darius saw that Daniel was to be made chief president of the realm. If anything could have been said against the character of Joseph, or

even against his personal appearance and manner, now was the time to say it. But not only was his character impregnable, but his bearing was faultless. A handsome young man of thirty, with a goodly and well-favored person, he bore himself in Pharaoh's presence with deference and with self-respect. Slavery and imprisonment had not hurt the tone of his native manliness. All he lacked, when he left the prison, to make him appear before Pharaoh, as a chivalrous gentleman, was that he should shave himself and change his raiment, and this he had found time to do. And so the lords of Egypt, when asked if Joseph was not the man for the hour, were silent. But where were *Potiphar and his wife?* Why did they not come to the help of these disappointed nobles, with their miserable falsehood? Now is their opportunity. Let them speak now or forever after hold their peace. Perhaps they were dead. The wicked sometimes do not live out half their days. If they were living, Potiphar may have discovered, by subsequent transactions, that, on certain subjects, the word of his wife must be taken with some allowance. And Potiphar's wife may have come to feel that the best thing that could happen to her was never to have her lie mentioned again.

I have said that Pharaoh, so far as we can learn, could get no answer from his lords to the question which he asked. And so he answered for himself. "And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and he made him ride in the second chariot which he had; and they said before him, 'Bow the knee': and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt."

5. Again we notice that Joseph was appointed to office on the sole ground of his merit. No effort was made by him or by any other human being to obtain the place for him. No petitions were circulated, no deputations waited upon Pharoah, no favorite's favorite was quietly solicited to use his influence, no one even asked the king's wife to talk with her husband, in order that this man might have a cabinet position. He was not a "favorite son," nor even a "dark horse." There was nothing to give him the place but simply his fitness for it. Pharaoh's reasons for appointing him have been given to the world. "And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, 'Forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art; thou shalt be over my house, and according unto thy word shall all

my people be ruled.'" Joseph had given two evidences of broad statesmanship: first, he had clearly foreseen a great national calamity which no one else could have foreseen; and second, he had prepared a plan to meet it. Pharaoh thought that the man who had done all this was the man to put the plan into execution, and he committed the work to his hands. It was a piece of sound practice in the civil service. There was, practically, a competitive examination, in which Joseph was first, and all the others were nowhere. There was no other human being who had any idea of the future evil or of the way to avert it.

II. Having thus spoken of some qualifications for public position possessed by Joseph before he took office, let us next briefly consider the qualities which he exhibited after he came into power, or how he did his work as a statesman.

1. And here I remark, first of all, that when appointed to the place of prime minister, he at once and wholly gave himself to the duties of the office. To him the position was no sinecure. He knew that it would task all his powers to fill it successfully, and he decided not to spare himself in meeting the responsibility laid upon him. He was no courtier, and he had no jeal-

ousies. He cherished no malice, and he retained no grudges—a quality of highest value in a statesman. He had no enemies to punish. He had kept his mind pure and sweet. Sunshine itself was not whiter or sweeter or more luminous than the soul of Pharaoh's chief ruler. In return for the terrible wrong which his brothers had done him, after having administered to them enough of loving discipline to make them see and repent of their sin, he gave them a possession in the best of the land and nourished them with bread according to their families. He had no thought of staying at court to watch against the intrigues of those who wished to supplant him. Probably he did not believe in the existence of such persons, or, if he did, he had no time to give them. He lived in the field. The sacred writer says, "And Joseph went out from the presence of Pharaoh and went throughout all the land of Egypt." To protect the land from the coming evil, we now have a man well equipped in mind and heart, with a clean conscience and a serene breast, and a man free from self-seeking and with an eye single to his duty, a man with nothing on his mind but the work to be done.

2. It has been said that no man can become a great statesman by merely attending to

the petty details of administration. He must have an object that will fill the mind and enlarge the heart. And this brings me to remark that the history of Joseph meets this requirement. His objects were noble, and beneficent, and worthy of a great ruler. He undertook to save a great race and a large part of the world from extinction. A famine for Egypt meant a famine also for Abyssinia, Arabia, Syria, and Palestine, and sometimes even for the remoter, populous regions around the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates. The causes of this are well understood. A writer in Lange's Commentary upon Genesis says, "Aside from the fact that Egypt, in the early times, was a granary for the neighboring countries, and that they therefore suffered also from every famine that came upon it, it is a thing to be noticed that the rain-season for these lands, as well as the rising of the Nile, was conditioned on northern rainy winds." "All countries," says Moses in the Book of Genesis, "came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn, because the famine was sore in all lands." There was no presumption in the claim of Joseph that God had sent him into Egypt as his agent to accomplish a vast, beneficent plan. "God," said he to his brethren, "meant it unto good, to

bring to pass as it is this day, to save much people alive." To the same effect is a passage in the 105th Psalm: "Moreover he called for a famine upon the land, he brake the whole staff of bread. He sent a man before them, even Joseph, who was sold for a servant. * * * The king sent and loosed him; even the ruler of the people, and let him go free. He made him lord of his house, and ruler of all his substance, to bind his princes at his pleasure and to teach his senators wisdom." So far then as the greatness of his object is concerned, no statesman in history appears with more dignity than Joseph. The contemplation of it fills and warms the imagination, and imparts to the mind a noble expansion. But for some plan like that of Joseph, the highest civilization then known to the world must have perished with the dwellers by the Nile; the church of God in the earth must have been blotted out in the persons of the patriarchs and their families, and many thousands of people in adjoining countries must have perished. It was not Oriental extravagance, but a swift insight into the magnitude of the occasion, which made Pharaoh bestow upon Joseph the name "Zaphnath-paaneah," which in Lange's work is translated "Preserver of Life," or "Saviour of the world."

3. Once more, not only was Joseph a statesman with a grand object, but the means which he employed were worthy of the object, and were chosen with the greatest wisdom. His measures were adequate and reasonable—they would accomplish the object, they were not oppressive, and they were carried out with the greatest tact and skill.

To appreciate this it may be necessary to look a moment at the economic difficulties which he had to meet. Political economists tell us that a young nation which has prospered so far as to have a full year's subsistence in advance, has taken an important step in the way of progress. It is stated by statisticians that the aggregate wealth of Great Britain, which is the richest country in the world, is only equal to five or six times—let us say six times—its annual production. Its expenditure is less than its production, because it is constantly adding to its wealth. Hence it is estimated that its total wealth is equal to about eight times its annual expenditure. If, therefore, production in Great Britain were suddenly to cease, and the nation had to fall back upon its accumulated wealth for subsistence, then, if expenditure were to continue as free as in the past, at the end of eight years the country would be reduced to absolute

beggary. The lands, the houses, the factories, the docks, the harbors, the ships, the railways, the cattle, might still be there; but they would not belong to the people of England, but to somebody who should have advanced upon them the means of subsistence. I do not like to anticipate, but I cannot help thinking what joy it would then give to a great people, standing on the brink of extinction, could it be suddenly announced that they could be put back into possession of all that they had had, with production renewed, on condition that henceforth they would pay one-fifth of their annual production to the crown. And what honor would be paid to any prime minister, no matter whether it might be Lord Salisbury or Mr. Gladstone, who should have carried them through this dreary period of decay, and brought them to so happy a result!

Our knowledge of Egypt is not complete enough for the purposes of accurate comparison, but her ability to pass through long periods of unproductiveness must have been much less than that of Great Britain. To attempt to name a definite ratio between the aggregates of wealth in the two countries would be mere conjecture, but I deem it safe to say, and in this I think I should be sustained by thought-

ful readers of history, that the wealth per capita of Great Britain, measured by its value in the necessaries of life, was more than double that of Egypt. Moreover the expenses of the Egyptian government were very great for so small a country. Her officials lived luxuriously, and her Pharaohs thought it necessary to support an army of four hundred and ten thousand men. Production in Egypt was mostly agricultural, and when the crops failed, she was speedily impoverished. In fruitful years she had considerable manufactures and trade, but when there was no more corn, these also languished. Years, therefore, when the Nile failed to water and to fertilize the soil were years of terrible destitution. There were now coming seven years of plenty to be followed by seven years of famine. The problem, therefore, was, how to make the years of plenty, while they lasted, support the seven millions of the population, maintain the army, and pay the expenses of the government, and yield a surplus large enough to support people, government, and army through the seven years of nearly total unproductiveness. I almost think it the most difficult problem that any statesman ever successfully solved. One thing to be done would of course be to warn the people of the

coming famine, to exhort them against waste, to urge them to lay up all the corn they could spare for the time of want. This would make an effective impression upon the thoughtful and prudent, but very little upon the mass of the people. The improvidence of the Eastern races is proverbial. An average Egyptian would hardly be able to see why he should lay up corn this year for a famine that is to come seven years hence. This may seem strange, but some of our own people cannot be taught to save something in July for the following January. Joseph's plan, therefore, was that the government should supplement the partial preparation which was all that the people could be persuaded to make, by collecting each year, in the form of a tax, a liberal share of the corn produced, and storing it up until it should be needed. When explaining Pharaoh's dream, he named one-fifth as the share to be taken, but from the language used in describing the execution of his plan, I infer that, in practice, he may have taken more.

We shall now see Joseph visiting all parts of Egypt, organizing the people, appointing subordinates, building store-houses, punishing peculators. Even during the years of plenty, he will encounter many difficulties. There will

be dissatisfaction, impatience, irritation, even mutiny, among the people. Some will think the tax too high; others will wonder that so much power should have been placed in the hands of a Hebrew slave; others still, as one year of plenty succeeds to another, will be skeptical about the years of famine, and will begin to think that they are an invention of the government to enrich itself. Those who are too indolent or too dull to think will have positive opinions as to the wisdom of his system; those who are too selfish to coöperate will doubt his disinterestedness; those who are watching their opportunity to steal will suspect his integrity. He must soothe, explain, rebuke, or punish, as the case may require. He must have courage, tact, patience, good-nature, self-control. But, at length, the years of plenty are passed, and the years of famine have begun. The people are encouraged to live as long as possible upon what they have saved, and then the store-houses are opened. Now Joseph can enforce a strict economy in the use of grain among the people, by limiting the amount to be sold to individuals or families. The people brought him money to be exchanged for corn so long as it lasted, and next sold him their cattle, and finally their lands. They

even speak of their bodies as being for sale, and Joseph himself says, "Behold, I have bought you this day." We must not make the mistake, however, of supposing that this implies a condition of chattel slavery, such as was once known in our Southern States. The context shows that it meant nothing more than what was implied in their having parted with all they had—their money, their cattle, and their lands—and being now in a state of dependence upon the generosity of Joseph. They could ask to be nothing more than servants to the king. Everything was gone, and their condition was indeed sad enough. But if you will once more read the passage, I think you will feel that the cheerful frankness with which they acknowledge their beggared condition, implies that the character and the very face of Joseph have inspired them with hope of something better. I think they were not altogether taken by surprise when Joseph exclaimed, "Yes, you are beggars, but you shall not remain so. Years of plenty are now coming again. Go back to your lands and sow them once more. I will give you the seed for the first year, and you shall possess the lands as heretofore, except that you shall henceforth pay one-fifth of the annual produce into the king's treasury." "Four parts shall

be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones." I don't remember to have noticed whether the Egyptians were in the habit of shouting in honor of their rulers, but if they were, I will venture to say that old Nile had never before been so startled in his bed as by the shout that went up from the people that day. It was indeed a great deliverance for the people—a great triumph for the ruler. To me it appears to be the best single piece of work ever done by a statesman.

Under the circumstances the tax of one-fifth of the produce was certainly low. No doubt it was higher than the former tax, which is conjectured to have been a tenth. It was just that the government should receive something for its extraordinary service, and it may have been rendered necessary by its growing wants. If the increase in taxation was a tenth, then that tenth is the measure of the final injury of this unparalleled famine to the people of Egypt. Did any other statesman ever reduce such a calamity to so small a minimum?

The reasonableness of this tax of one-fifth of the produce will be still more evident if we compare it with rates prevalent among ourselves at the present day. In most growing

Ohio towns, the property-holder is taxed from twenty-five to thirty mills to the dollar. If we assume the average income of the citizen from all his property to be six per cent, or sixty mills to the dollar—an estimate which is high enough—he then pays to the Government five-twelfths or one-half of his "produce." If we can pay a tax like this without complaint, the Egyptians under Joseph certainly had no reason to feel oppressed by the payment of one-fifth.

I must not leave this part of my subject without noticing a grave charge made by some critics against Joseph as a man and as a statesman. It is said that although an able minister, at heart he was a courtier, and that, in the interest of the king, he inflicted a permanent injury upon Egypt by changing the whole body of agriculturists from a community of freeholders to a community of tenants of the crown. Before the time of Joseph, it is contended, the people owned the land themselves; after his time the king owned it. Joseph thus destroyed that class who are the pride and strength of every land where they exist—the yeomanry. At first I felt perplexed by this. On the surface of the narrative it seemed to be true. I remembered the just pride with which our New

England ancestors regarded their warrantee deeds to the rocks on which they stood, and I said it would have been a great calamity to them to have been changed into mere tenants of the President of the United States. But it soon occurred to me to inquire in what sense the lands of the people were theirs before the time of Joseph, and in what sense they were Pharaoh's after that time. No doubt that before Joseph the people called the land theirs, but was it theirs in a sense which prevented the dispossession of the farmers of large districts when the Pharaoh wished to give an estate to a successful soldier? Was it theirs in a sense which would protect them from a repartition of the land whenever the royal policy required it? Certainly not. The king was an absolute monarch. His will was law. He was the only legislative power. He made the laws, and he made the judges who interpreted and applied the laws. Mr. Samuel Birch, the keeper of the Egyptian Antiquities in the British Museum, a great authority, says, in his edition of Wilkinson's Egypt, that a new Pharaoh re-invested even the territorial aristocracy with their lands, either on the ground that they were only feudal tenants, or that the king was the landlord of the whole country. Wilkinson, following He-

rodotus, states that Rameses the Great ordered a repartition of lands among the peasants. This was indeed later than the time of Joseph, but the kings before Joseph were certainly not less absolute than those who followed him. The only security which the people had, before Joseph, for the continued possession of their lands, was found in the forbearance and good sense of their kings. This security generally did not fail them, sometimes it did. Substantially the same state of things existed after Joseph, except that growing wealth and civilization were favorable to fair dealing, permanency, and good order. Further, under the arrangement made by Joseph, which appears to have continued at least until the time of Moses, and probably much longer, the gratitude of the people to the government as their preserver, and the gratification of the government over its doubled and now adequate revenues from the lands, no doubt made the mutual relations of king and landowners more satisfactory and less liable to disturbance than they had been before Joseph's time. I will venture to say that the title of the farming class to their lands was treated with more respect, and was more like that of fee simple, after the new system had been introduced by Joseph than it

ever had been before. So much for the charge that Joseph deprived the Egyptians of their ancient title to the soil.

Such, very imperfectly presented, was the statesmanship of Joseph. The subject is full of lessons upon none of which can we dwell, but any one of which might be expanded into an essay. In what other portion of human history is the providence of God, in its relation both to public and to private life, more wonderful, more encouraging, or better fitted to produce faith in him? Where else can a finer example be found of that courage in national affairs which faces an appalling calamity at its worst, abating nothing from its terrors, and then prepares to meet it and avert its worst effects? From what other leaf of human experience do we obtain so clear a view of the value, the blessing, the irresistible might, whether for the statesman or the man, of that greatest quality of the soul which is variously named the fear of God, personal integrity, a clear conscience, a heart of love, disinterestedness, devotion to the common welfare? Disinterestedness! how respectable, how prevailing, how universally approved it is! It is the very soul of successful statesmanship. It was the animating spirit of the statesmanship

of Joseph; and when that spirit shall fully take possession of and control the statesmanship of our own country, in that one expression of the divine goodness, all the dark problems that perplex us will be solved.

From this study of Joseph as a statesman, we turn, with unusual satisfaction, to consider the character of the new administration which has just assumed power at Washington. I would not introduce, in this place, anything which could be thought an expression of party feeling, but I have a strong impression that good men of all parties are looking forward hopefully to the next four years. It is occasion for deep thankfulness to all patriotic minds, that a President has recently been inaugurated, over forty-five States, who, for many years, with unaffected piety, has worshiped God as his Sovereign and his Redeemer. The genuineness of his religious character, which has not been questioned; his single-hearted devotion to such measures as, in his honest judgment, will best promote the common welfare; the sympathy which he has constantly expressed for sound morals, general education, reverence for law, and honest government; his irreproachable private character, and the estimable personal qualities which he has exhibited in all the

relations of life; his true friendliness to all Americans; the ability and candor of his official papers; the sound judgment, the moderation, and freedom from personality which distinguish the innumerable speeches which he made during the canvass; the affability, the dignity, and the courteous reserve with which he received the thousands of visitors who waited upon him at his home; the high character of the officers whom he has gathered about him in his Cabinet —all these qualities and acts, which remind us of the statesmanship of Joseph; furnish ground for hope that the administration upon which we have now entered will prove to be one of the most useful, one of the most catholic, and one of the purest which the nation has ever seen.

tions of life; his true friendliness to all
ricans; the ability and candor of his official
ers; the sound judgment, the moderation,
freedom from personality which distinguish
immemorable speeches which he made dur-
the canvass; the affability, the dignity, and
courteous reserve with which he received
the thousands of visitors who waited upon him

Date Due

1 00302

E415.7 .M75 1899

Monroe, James, 1821-1898.
Oberlin Thursday lectures, addresses and essays

39967003331738